

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1870</a>	Option B	Comment	Option B - not loss of Green Belt and reusing the brownfields, consider going for option B
	<a href="#">LPPO3032</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>Question 3 - Do you prefer a more dispersed strategy?</p> <p>Answer. - Yes, as the District Council in not in control of the provision of a relief road/school provision it cannot guarantee their provision.</p> <p>Favour Option B.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3045</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>If a choice had to be made between Option A and Option B, which should not be necessary for at least the next 10 years, based upon the house building projections, I would choose Option B since this would use 22% less Green Belt land (218 hectares compared to 266 hectares in Option A). It would also provide potential residential building of 6559 dwellings compared to only 6304 dwellings in Option A, 255 more dwellings. It would enable development to be more evenly spread around the Wyre Forest in areas where local communities need dwellings for organic growth, rather than in the overcrowded Spennells area. This would place less stress upon existing infrastructure around Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3053</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>Kidderminster central and its surrounding areas have so many brownfield sites in which to build and develop. Building in these areas, could regenerate Kidderminster central and transform it from the ghost town it currently is.</p> <p>I am asking that you choose option B as the better option for our area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2691</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>I am writing to express my objections to the local plan review preferred options consultation.</p> <p>They are as follows-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Councils own statistics show that there are enough brown fields/other capability to fulfil government targets for ten more years. The proposal is for five years (beginning in 2019 will run until seven years from now), and as such no release of Green Belt land will</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>be necessary during this period- “The Green Belt is 13% of the land. We can solve this crisis without having to take huge tracts out of the Green Belt,” the housing minister, Gavin Barwell, said. “They can take land out of the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances but they should have looked at every other alternative first,” he said, including building on brownfield land, releasing surplus government land, increasing the density of projects in towns and cities, or partnering with neighbouring Councils.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst I appreciate that there are difficulties in attracting building companies to build upon more difficult sites, allowing the release of more lucrative ‘easier option’ sites will only exacerbate this problem. It may be argued that the Council can negotiate a ‘tie in’ for companies to build upon brownfield/other sites alongside ‘easier’ options, they will then be able to pay a levy to the Council rather than completing these obligations. The Council will not, however, be obliged to spend these resources in Kidderminster/to improve local housing stock that utilises brownfield/other sites.</li> <li>• The preferred option A removes more than twice the amount of Green Belt from our local area than option B (2% as opposed to the Government’s nation benchmark of 1%). This option is purported to allow for new road networks and supporting, but as no information is available, it must be assumed that this is a desire rather than an absolute fact. If one of the two options is to be adopted then option B is the most appropriate, as it will simply extend an already existing new development area with its own direct transport links to both the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge main roads.</li> <li>• In light of the above points my vote as a constituent of this area is that- Firstly, that both plans A and B are unnecessary and unacceptable, but that secondly IF one must be adopted, then it should be plan B.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP02533</a>	Option B	Comment	I prefer Option B. I do not feel the benefits of a more dispersed strategy outweigh the disadvantages, however, the reasoned justifications for Option A seems flawed in many ways, see previous comments.
	<a href="#">LPP02276</a>	Option B	Comment	Which sites do you prefer? – Dispersed Option B

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3801</a>	Option B	Comment	I object to the Council's strategy for development; evidence shows that the scale is unnecessary. However I <b>prefer Option B</b> notwithstanding I object to the analysis re scale of development.
	<a href="#">LPPO3361</a>	Option B	Comment	Option B is more reasonable and realistic, but I would still question whether the existing infrastructure can support such a large number of new houses and the families that will live in them.  Kidderminster currently I believe has 3 ambulances and only 1 permanent fire fighting crew. Stourport has 1 ambulance car.  Kidderminster hospital has been desecrated and as we all know, all 3 hospitals that serve the area are in special measures with services at bursting point or having been removed completely.  What plans do the local authority have to support, maintain services and protect the health and safety of people living in the district?
	<a href="#">LPPO4497</a>	Option B	Comment	Option B is my choice but no option chosen should include Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPPO4455</a>	Option B	Comment	Concern re loss of Green Belt
	<a href="#">LPPO4458</a>	Option B	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Static population growth - no need for new houses.</li> <li>• Aging population downsizing - freeing up family sized houses.</li> <li>• High obesity levels - why build on Green Belt land where leisure and exercise activities occur.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4459</a>	Option B	Comment	We refer first to your request for residents to choose between options A and B of this Review. We prefer neither but wish to comment on their relative merits. In your document the choice is clearly presented in favour of Option A based on two major considerations: 1. provision of educational, medical and community facilities and 2. Provision of a relief road between the Worcester and Birmingham roads. It appears that this advice is related to planning convenience

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>for WFDC. Our comments are:</p> <p>1. Wherever additional housing is built, extra facilities will need to be provided whether they be centralised in just one conglomeration, or existing provisions are expanded to suit needs.</p> <p>If one of the two options A or B has to be chosen then Option B would be the most equitable way of accommodating the suggested housing requirement.</p> <p>Non-Green Belt sites available for building can provide in the region of 3000 houses. This number should surely be more than sufficient for local needs.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04449</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>Option B requires the acquisition of numerous sites making the process slower and more complex. The additional educational and other facilities required would therefore be more piecemeal and less straightforward. Some sites in Stourport already have permission for development. Transport links are not particularly well supported and the already congested town of Stourport does not have the option for use of a relief road.</p>
West Midland Bird Club	<a href="#">LPP04409</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>We strongly object to both proposals because of the devastating effect these proposals would have on all wildlife within the planned areas. This land is Green Belt Land, South of Spennells and WFDC Core area, East of Offmore Estate. These areas should be maintained for farming and for recreational use such as walking and bird, butterfly and moth surveying. The public foot paths and bridle ways are used daily by both residents and visitors.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04411</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>Both options rely on developing Green Belt land which I believe is the 'easy way out' for the council and is supported by some extremely questionable 'evidence', particularly the extremely poor quality of the 'objective assessment of housing need'.</p> <p>Developing Green Belt land is extremely short sighted for a number of reasons, but especially in the light of 'Brexit' as the Green Belt land earmarked by the council is very productive farm land which will be of benefit to the country (and of course, local farmers) if tariffs are placed on</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>produce grown in Europe.</p> <p>The Green Belt is also supposed to stop communities merging into one another and becoming yet another urban sprawl.</p> <p>Building on Green Belt land is also the easy and most attractive option for developers, and the easy option for the council. The council should not give in to pressure from developers and land owners eager to make a 'quick buck' instead of thinking more creatively about where new housing should be allowed, but instead should consider the needs and well-being of local people and put them at the fore-front of their decision making.</p> <p>Both options also mean a disproportionate amount of housing development would centre on and around Kidderminster, which does not have the infrastructure to support it. The schools are now near or at capacity, so where does the money come from to provide new schools for these developments?</p> <p>I would challenge the need for so many homes in the area. The growth forecasts on the OAHN have been over-inflated, as there has not been significant rise in the local population in the past 10-15 years.</p> <p>There is very little employment actually in the Wyre Forest and most people commute to bigger towns and cities to work. Already, all roads in and out of Kidderminster are congested during the morning and evening 'rush hours' and building more, unnecessary, homes would make that worse, as people would come to live here, but have to commute elsewhere to work.</p> <p>My preferred choice of the two is B, as it has less impact on Green Belt land, especially with regards to the fields adjacent to Spennells.</p> <p>Although I reluctantly support option B, I do not think we have been offered a fair choice at all and if this is indeed a consultation exercise, perhaps the planning policy team will take on board</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				the objections I and hundreds of others in the Wyre Forest have submitted and come up with a better thought out option C. Finally, it seems unreasonable that an unelected planning policy team and a few local councillors on the planning committee have the power to make such momentous decisions that will have such a detrimental impact on so many people’s lives. Some of the planning committee also have Green Belt land earmarked for re-designation in their ward and will naturally be under pressure from residents to oppose development there and instead vote for it in another ward. I hope that this will not be allowed to happen.
	<a href="#">LPP04415</a>	Option B	Comment	I do not support option B. I would urge you to consider the requirements of local residents, rather than those of large developers in this plan, as well as the implications of destroying the local countryside, which is well used and loved by the local community. Have a look at brownfield sites first.
	<a href="#">LPP04416</a>	Option B	Comment	Option B already has significant road access especially surrounding the Lea Castle area. 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
	<a href="#">LPP04418</a>	Option B	Comment	I neither fully support option A or B as they stand at present. 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. I do not support any surge to push housing onto Lea Castle so that building does not have to occur to the south/Spennells area or Stourport— any building should be fair to all areas and the load shared. There is argument that south of the town is better access to the motorways. I do not support building on the land opposite the entrance to Lea Castle. I am in support of a relief road, but were this not in the final plan then even more the need to ‘spread the load’ in terms of housing and commuting as well as easing traffic in already busy and congested areas. Controlling traffic flow/safety is paramount. Planning must take on board residents’ concerns so as not to disadvantage people like myself who have lived in Kidderminster

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				and the surrounding areas all their life. People need to feel that Wyre Forest District Council is there for all its people.
	<a href="#">LPP04419</a>	Option B	Comment	Prefer Option B.
	<a href="#">LPP04431</a>	Option B	Comment	I would like to highlight my objection to WFDCs plan to sacrifice large swathes of Green Belt land around Kidderminster for housing development and do not support option B.
	<a href="#">LPP04251</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>We are in favour of a sensibly modified Option B for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Population Growth figures suggested in the report are speculative and dependent upon the aspirational target for employment growth.</li> <li>• Option A states there is no significant natural interest in Spennells Fields and the site known as Captains. This is incorrect.</li> <li>• The local infrastructure demands of any development are not addressed.</li> <li>• 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 Stations. A bypass consumes large quantities of land.</li> <li>• Option A will not address the need for affordable homes. (CRE)</li> <li>• There will be a major and significant loss of amenity to the residents of Spennells should Option A be adopted.</li> <li>• The suggested growth of Employment Opportunities in the Wyre Forest is not supported by current employment patterns.</li> <li>• Watercourses are already compromised in the area known as (WFR/ST/1) Captains and The Lodge.</li> <li>• The loss of Green Belt, arable land and hedgerows should not focus in the main on one particular area. Wyre Forest will be best served with a geographically widespread plan.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04367</a>	Option B	Comment	Only support if all the alternatives to Green Belt development have been fully explored and any development was dispersed.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04654</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>In effect, both Options A and B suggest ribbon development. Neither option envisages a community that could be centred in the midst of the development.</p> <p><u>Option B</u> the second bullet point says “Additional development at Lea Castle will put additional pressures onto the A551 and A449”. This statement ignores the fact that Baldwin Road, and Hurcott Road, are already used as a rat run for traffic on the A456 from Birmingham travelling to and from Stourbridge and Wolverhampton. Development to the east in both options may also be used in this way. In addition, the Government’s own policy “to conserve, enhance and restore the diversity of England’s wildlife” would be compromised by the effects on Hurcott village nature area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04840</a>	Option B	Comment	<p>I have questioned the impact of an Eastern Relief Road. If Option A was adopted a new access road would be required but other than access to the new developments it is not shown how it would relieve congestion on the existing network. Any development would increase air pollution. More analysis would be required here.</p> <p>‘The absence of additional infrastructure impacting on ....educational provision’ is at odds with the Draft Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2017), which indicates the estimated Education Infrastructure Costs for Option A at about £30m and about £25m for option B. This indicates an impact of the same order of magnitude and therefore at this stage of the argument probably not significant.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP05124</a>	Option B	Comment	Option B uses less Green Belt and creates more houses yet isn't the council's preferred option.
	<a href="#">LPP03152</a>	Option B	Object	Concern with option B.
	<a href="#">LPP0487</a>	Option B	Object	I object to Option B
	<a href="#">LPP0426</a>	Option B	Object	<p>I object to Option B.</p> <p>Green Belt land should be used only as a VERY LAST RESORT.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Wyre Forest, Greater Birmingham, Solihull and Worcestershire should collaborate and collectively review overall brown field site availability and plan housing development accordingly – decisions to build on the Green Belt should not be based on local authority boundaries.</p> <p>The 5 year rolling time frame for construction sites should allow for regular reviews of brown field sites and enable changes to be incorporated into any plan,.</p> <p>The plan fails to recognise changes in shopping habits and unrealistically targets retail expansion and comparison shopping.</p> <p>Kidderminster has suffered from the failure to 'tidy up 'following the migration of Kidderminster town centre to Weavers Wharf and Crossley Retail Park.</p> <p>Retail premises and the courts building have been empty for 8 /9 years - the regeneration of such sites require radical solutions for alternative use that reduce any need to build on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Unnecessary decisions are being taken now e.g. in 1999 who could have predicted the impacts of the 2007/08 economic collapse or changes caused by online shopping (indeed, the plan itself demonstrates an inability to predict /understand short term population levels in the District).</p> <p>The plan fails in its stated aim to "to use a robust and up-to-date evidence base to ensure that the local plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area" . Instead it aims to justify what developers want to deliver rather than meet the needs of Kidderminster residents.</p> <p>Previous attempts to build an Eastern relief road have failed - the plan fails to present evidence based data that supports it in economic or environmental terms - at the consultation session I was informed this would be a single carriageway 40 mph road following the same route as the existing road from the Worcester Road through Mustow Green to the Birmingham Road - is it</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>really a relief road at all?</p> <p>Whilst constructing a new school in the Spennells area appears attractive this (together with the promise of the 'relief road' shouldn't be the determining factor when opting to build on the Green Belt – other options should be sought.</p> <p>Many people commute into / and out of Kidderminster now (hence the railway station development) - and have done so for many years. This situation equally relates to the areas covered by the LEPs identified in the plan.</p> <p>Whilst economic development in Kidderminster will be welcome - past experience shows this will take time – in the meantime people will continue to travel.</p> <p>Immediate need is for fresh radical thinking that optimises the use of brown field sites throughout the LEP areas for residential use and enables Kidderminster itself to become a modern, contained and attractive town centre that incorporates retail leisure and residential opportunities rather than pursue outdated models from the past - 'mixed use' communicates little other than the elements of 'wishful thinking' so often reported in the local press over numerous years.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO366</a>	Option B	Object	<p>If new houses are required the infrastructure MUST be in place which has to include roads (Stourport is already gridlocked most of the time) schools are oversubscribed and doctors at capacity.</p> <p>Green Belt must be protected at all costs, use brownfield sites first for any houses/schools and doctors.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO402</a>	Option B	Object	See summary LPPO400.
	<a href="#">LPPO614</a>	Option B	Object	This was published under the 2010 to 2015 Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>government-:</p> <p>This government has been very clear that when planning for new buildings, protecting our precious Green Belt must be <u>paramount</u>.</p> <p>Local people don't want to lose their countryside to urban sprawl, or see the vital green land around their towns and cities go to unnecessary development.</p> <p>The council can meet their housing needs by prioritizing Brownfield sites, and fortify the Green Belt in their area.</p> <p>Only when every brown field site is exhausted should any consideration be given to Green Belt land.</p> <p>Greatest concern is the pollution due to vehicle exhausts, it is already very high due to queuing traffic outside of my home which is close to Burlish Crossing.</p> <p>I live next to Green Belt land and would like it to remain so. I say no to Plan B.</p> <p>I am strongly against any Green Belt land being used until all brown sites have been used.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2073</a>	Option B	Object	<p>Please respond to following::</p> <p>The infrastructure for option B's dispersal strategy is of concern. Stourport facilities can't cope now e.g. lack of public toilets, so improved infrastructure - schools, roads, doctors, fire services needed first.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Building a new town possibly at Lea Castle, is more sensible/cost effective and</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				centralising will reduce the impact on Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO2079</a>	Option B	Object	Option A, with an eastern by-pass/new link road from Birmingham Road, is preferable to Option B.  Kidderminster and Stourport are already stretched - doctors, dentists, schools and heavy summer traffic w/o any new development.  Option B has always been farmland so despite need for extra housing, the sites in Areley Kings are not feasible and opposed to by myself/others. The road from Areley Kings to Stourport is narrow and could not cope with extra traffic.
	<a href="#">LPPO1902</a>	Option B	Object	Plan B would be unthinkable with the number of houses to be built adding to the already ridiculous amount of traffic on the Areley Kings side of the bridge! The infrastructure would never cope with more cars, people dying for space! The schools, doctors and roads are at breaking point now!!
	<a href="#">LPPO1939</a>	Option B	Object	I object to both Options and I think it should be re-thought. This is a massive decision for Wyre Forest so we must be sure to get it right. Protect all Green Belt as far as possible.
	<a href="#">LPPO2954</a>	Option B	Object	Nobody wants to lose greenfield sites and would hope that all brownfield sites would be developed before any other land was considered.  Stourport/Bewdley area would be worse off because of the heavy traffic problems already experienced by crossing the bridges. It seems that Option A would include new infrastructure whereas Option B will not include any.
	<a href="#">LPPO2895</a>	Option B	Object	In the draft plan there are aspirations to redress the imbalance in the age of the population, attract more business and jobs. Destroying the Green Belt to build houses does nothing to address these aspects of Kidderminster's future. The idea that almost 6000 houses are required when clearly the population of Kidderminster is not growing at a significant rate seems like a

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>grossly inflated figure. The 2.7% increase in the last two years is almost certainly the effect of increased immigration from Europe, which may reduce as some return to their own countries following Brexit.</p> <p><b>Average age and jobs:</b> To lower the average age of the population it is necessary to attract young people to the town for which you need jobs and cheap housing. In fact the biggest problem facing youngsters today throughout the UK is that they can't afford to get on the housing ladder. Just building new houses on Green Belt land will not help. A potential solution to the housing problem would be to have the derelict and unoccupied properties, of which there are many, in the town converted to flats. This may require the use of compulsory purchase orders, which must be within the power of the Council. The resultant dwellings, would be cheaper to buy or rent, would attract young people and would help to revive the town centre. The proposed use of the Glades site for retail should be changed to more flats for the same reason. Cheap housing will not be found on Spennells Green Belt. Young people will be the people to develop new businesses; older people with established careers will be reluctant to take risks.</p> <p><b>Green Belt effect:</b> Building houses on green field sites to the east of Kidderminster could have an adverse effect on the average age of the population. Any developer building on that land will want to build 4 &amp; 5 bed houses not only to increase his revenue but also to recover the cost of the land he has purchased. They will not want to provide affordable housing at the 30% level. This will attract commuters from Birmingham and Worcester. And will exacerbate the commuting problem.</p> <p><b>My objection:</b> I am strongly opposed to both of your preferred options. I believe that developing cheap flats for younger people will balance the ageing problem and help to create new businesses. I believe that to meet the need for affordable housing all brownfield sites in the town should be redeveloped first. No Green Belt land should be built on until the redevelopment of the town centre has been completed and all flats occupied.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2896</a>	Option B	Object	I understand and accept that more housing needs to be built in the Wyre Forest area but I feel it

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>is essential to upgrade, develop and extend road ways/links which are already very busy in order to keep traffic flowing.</p> <p>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 Wolverley Secondary school have very restrictive vehicle access and parking capacity. I think provision for new school(s) would be essential.</p> <p>Hospital — It is my opinion that 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 — we cannot keep adding to the pressure of Worcester and Russell’s Hall.</p> <p>Of the two options proposed in the local plan review, I think Option A is preferable as it includes the relief road which surely is desperately needed and suggests better school provision.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2855</a>	Option B	Object	I strongly object to Option B.
	<a href="#">LPPO2863</a>	Option B	Object	Option B is more dispersed and will not bring any improvements but will worsen traffic congestion on Bewdley and Stourport bridges and affect the air quality in Dunley Road area
	<a href="#">LPPO2747</a>	Option B	Object	Objection to the whole draft local plan for Wyre Forest.
	<a href="#">LPPO2702</a>	Option B	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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>existing one is obviously biased.</p> <p>If no alternative can be found I prefer Option B as it develops less of the Green Belt and it is much fairer to spread the developments. People prefer to have a choice of area to live in to be close to existing friends and family so I believe spreading out development would be better for the people of Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2709</a>	Option B	Object	<p>Please note my objections to both Option A and Option B of the Local Plan Preferred options.</p> <p>I don't think it's fair to offer a Plan A and B which both involve destroying our local Green Belt which is so close to many of our residents' hearts. Green space is important for emotional and physical wellbeing. As a nation, we grow less than two-thirds of our own food. Now, more than ever, we need to avoid unnecessarily losing our countryside. Why can't we utilise our brownfield land instead of destroying our precious countryside, which is home to rare and endangered wildlife like the Corn Bunting, Long-eared Bat and a Horseshoe Bat.</p> <p>I have lived in Kidderminster many years and have always valued the local Green Belt. It played a huge part in my childhood wellbeing and I have very fond memories of going on nature walks with my family and playing with my friends. Our Green spaces should be protected as once they are gone they are gone for good.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green spaces and farmland are important habitats for wildlife, some species of which are rare/endorsed i.e. the Corn Bunting.</li> <li>• In our efforts to tackle the housing crisis, suitable brownfield land and not Green Belt should be the priority. This should be utilised first and foremost, before any Green Belt land is even touched. What about the derelict and vandalised Sion Hill school site? There are places like this all over which have not been utilised after about a decade and yet you propose to destroy our Green Belt.</li> <li>• The amount of housing you propose to build is completely unnecessary and based on figures that apply to our nation as a whole and not the local area's needs. You have also</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>rounded figures up. This is completely unacceptable and one can only assume this has been done to make money first and foremost, and not with the wellbeing of our local people in mind.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our local government has only closed schools over the years and you now want to move thousands more people into our town. Where will they go to school? Where will they go to the doctors, or the hospital? How will our Police and Fire services cope with the increase? There already aren't enough GPs for the town's population and it's already difficult enough to get a doctor's appointment. Kidderminster Hospital has been downgraded.</li> <li>• I don't feel that this proposal has been purposely kept quiet- I only found out about it from a family member who had a leaflet through her door. I didn't have any warning whatsoever and neither did several other people I know. I also believe it has been designed in a way as to pit 2 parts of our town against each other, with one side hoping you will use Option A and the other wanting Option B with no option available to people who don't want any Green Belt used. Is this not an option?</li> <li>• Houses on the Silverwoods development remain unsold; why is there now a need for such massive development when there appears to be insufficient demand already? This huge building project was supposed to solve Kidderminster's housing needs for the foreseeable future. Once again this contradicts decisions made by the Planners. Was the mistake then or now?</li> <li>• There aren't enough jobs in the area to support this huge influx of people. This will render new developments commuter ghost towns and increase traffic on main roads.</li> </ul> <p>To summarise, I do not agree with Plan A or Plan B. I believe there is no need for such urban expansion.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2474</a>	Option B	Object	<p>In response to the two options on display at the planning consultation at Areley Kings Village Hall on 26<sup>th</sup> July I feel compelled to make the following observations and comments.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Option B is a non-starter for a number of reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The infrastructure in Stourport is inadequate to cope with the current demands of residents and the visitors, particularly during rush hours and summer weekends when the town is busy with holiday makers and tourists.</li> <li>2. During the peak hours it is now at present normal to be stuck in massive traffic jams to enter and exit the town with the bridge traffic often stationary. I would offer the view that even as things are, should a major incident occur requiring large numbers of emergency services vehicles needing to access the bridge, it would be impossible to be dealt with in an efficient manner and would inevitably result in delays resulting in serious injury and a potential loss of life due to the current volume of traffic.</li> </ol> <p>With this in mind I dread to think what the consequences could be with the additional housing and population should option B be adopted in the event of any unforeseen catastrophe?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If plan be were to be adopted where would the children of school age be educated? Two schools have been closed in the last few years, once again this will mean additional cars on the road during “the school run” which will also add to the problems mentioned above while increasing the parking problems associated with dropping off and collecting the children.</li> <li>2. As a pensioner with health problems I feel qualified to question whether the two doctor’s surgeries could cope with the additional influx of patients as it is not unusual to have to wait several days for an appointment now.</li> <li>3. About 10 years ago Vodafone applied to erect a telephone mast adjacent to the field in Pearl Lane. Research uncovered certain facts, one being the field on Pearl Lane is part of an “area of outstanding natural beauty” and as such cannot be built on! It goes without saying the proposal was turned down by the Planning Committee.</li> </ol> <p>In closing I wish to object to Plan B on the above mentioned grounds as I feel Kidderminster is better equipped to handle the increase in population and the town centre is in desperate need of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				the extra footfall to make it a viable area for future investment.
	<a href="#">LPP02269</a>	Option B	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 likely to leave. It is not clear in the Proposed Local plan if the areas required for additional medical</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>facilities are included in the plan or would be additional to it.</p> <p>10. Current public transport is very poor and needs substantial investment to serve the current population levels let alone increased population.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2275</a></p>	<p>Option B</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p><b>Option B</b></p> <p>Does not come with any new infrastructure and, therefore, any development west of the River Severn will increase congestion and pollution in both Stourport and Bewdley?</p> <p>In particular development at Areley Kings will exacerbate an already unacceptable level of congestion and pollution at the river crossing and along the High Street where the additional vehicle emissions occasioned by an additional 550 families (potentially 1000 plus vehicles) would require an Air Quality Management Plan which would be difficult if not impossible given the limited options in the restricted area of the High Street.</p> <p>The LPR also highlights concerns that the district has "Very poor public transport and high levels of traffic congestion with poor strategic transport infrastructure" (LPR; paragraph 2.10. p 15)</p> <p>This is especially the case in Stourport where it can take up to 20 minutes, at least, to cross the bridge from Areley Kings and negotiate the town centre by car and where most of the strategic car park at Vale Rd has already been sold to housing developers.</p> <p>Public transport is also very poor. The bus journeys from Bewdley and Stourport town centres, respectively, to Kidderminster bus station each takes over 30 minutes at best, meanders around several estates and provide no direct link to the railway station.</p> <p>Option B also fails to take into account pressures on local services such as doctors, police and fire that an additional 1547 families will make to Stourport's already oversubscribed amenities. The LPR itself describes the provision of additional sufficient, appropriately located education</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>facilities as "problematic". (LPR; paragraph 6.56, p45)</p> <p>It would also appear that Option B is less likely to meet the identified need for affordable housing. (LPR, Table 6.0.6, p41)</p> <p>A further disadvantage of option B is that it advocates urban sprawl in many different parts of the district. In addition to the problems of pollution and congestion already highlighted this encroachment on to the countryside will inevitably result in the loss of valuable agricultural land as well as natural habitats and would seem to contradict the council's overarching principle of "protecting and enhancing green infrastructure" (LPR, section 5.4, paragraph c vi, p22).</p> <p>Although it is understandable that many of the residents affected by option A will be deeply unhappy by the proposals this is clearly to be preferred to Option B as the new infrastructure and proximity to the economic opportunities of Birmingham and the Black Country will bring many advantages to the district as a whole.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2264</a>	Option B	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 mental health and wellbeing. Unsafe for our children to play out.</li> <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</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>grazes the land is to be protected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 a soak away, showers will lose pressure.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2403</a>	Option B	Object	<p>Prefer Option A which will bring much needed infrastructure improvements /job growth and other developmental benefits/investment in the area in terms of new businesses/other types of facilities and serve a greater proportion of the population than dispersed development of Option B.</p> <p>A new Kidderminster Eastern Relief road will ease congestion but Option B will bring no new benefits and worsen current traffic congestion in Bewdley/Stourport esp. Bridge area.</p> <p>Impact on emergency vehicles/rat runs could develop.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Pedestrian safety/lack pavements.</p> <p>Spoil views/peace and quiet of the countryside/impact on recreational use/loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>Impact on council's conservation policy lists</p> <p>Already pressures on medical/educational provision would be easier to provide in bigger developments.</p> <p>New incomes may commute so provide housing where road and public transport improvements can be provided.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP02404</a>	Option B	Object	<p>Support for Option A/object to Option B as it is unsustainable in the local area and is detrimental to the local community.</p> <p>Option A: New, much needed infrastructure improvements to serve more of the population than Option B which could impact on emergency vehicles/cause rat runs on narrow roads affecting pedestrian safety/loss of recreational land/views/agricultural land. Pressure upon medical/educational provision and few new job opportunities as opposed to Option A which may encourage job growth. More brown-field sites are available in and around Option B, rather than the greenfield area of Option A which may only attract commuters.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04140</a>	Option B	Object	I do not agree with any option that builds on Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPP04066</a>	Option B	Object	<p>Neither Option that you offer is totally consistent with the points made above and clearly I have concerns about both.</p> <p>I welcome the fact that the Town and District Councils have justifiably rejected the Gladman Appeal and their speculative proposals. But if they are approved what then? - surely we would not want to increase the damage done to our towns by their success by pressing ahead with</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				either of these options -particularly Option B which would have even greater and adverse effect on Bewdley and Stourport and their green surroundings.
	<a href="#">LPP04023</a>	Option B	Object	Option B should be rejected.
	<a href="#">LPP03858</a>	Option B	Object	<p>The expected travel time 10 minutes, the actual travel time was 25 minutes. The cause of the long traffic queue from the top of Dunley Road into town? There were no roadworks, the delay was purely down to the volume of traffic trying to move through Stourport. This was not a one-off event. It is not unusual for there to be long queues trying to cross Stourport bridge.</p> <p>If option B is selected, what plans are proposed to manage the extra traffic that is bound to arise with hundreds more houses expected?</p> <p>What plans are there for managing the fact that one of the proposed sites in Areley Kings lies on what was once marshland and is at the lowest point of the water table?</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03789</a>	Option B	Object	Plan B has disadvantages, inc. access to facilities/traffic congestion.
	<a href="#">LPP03657</a>	Option B	Object	Object to option B.
	<a href="#">LPP03659</a>	Option B	Object	Object to Option B
	<a href="#">LPP03275</a>	Option B	Object	I object to plan B and “Core sites”.
	<a href="#">LPP03224</a>	Option B	Object	<p>I think that by dispersing the developments it will bring major problems with infrastructure in particular, the roads and traffic congestion over the river bridges in Bewdley &amp; Stourport. For example, the increased traffic from the proposed developments at Areley Kings will only increase the known traffic congestion over the bridge and exacerbate the air quality issues in Stourport town centre/the Gilgal etc.</p> <p>The other issue is medical &amp; educational services. These would be family houses and would undoubtedly increase demand for school places and doctor’s services –both already under</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				pressure in both Bewdley & Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPP04498</a>	6.56	Object	Q 6.55 and 6.56: I wished to comment again on how the options for redevelopment have been unfairly portrayed. Question 6.55 outlines benefits of Option A before asking for an opinion whereas question 6.56 outlines the disadvantages of option B before asking for an opinion. In order for this document to fairly ask for people’s opinions without swaying their judgment both options should be weighed up with advantages and disadvantages before asking for the opinions of residents. The document should be impartial and allow residents to create their own opinions and decisions independently and without influence from the council.
	<a href="#">LPP04447</a>	Option B	Object	<p>Please note my objections to both Option A and Option B. First of all, there are areas common to both Options, on Green Belt land. Does this mean these cannot be questioned?</p> <p>My objection is not that Kidderminster needs no additional housing, but Green Belt land should not be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green space is important for emotional and physical wellbeing</li> <li>• Green space is a diminishing resource and should be protected. Once it is gone it cannot be regained</li> <li>• Loss of farmland will lead to insufficient food for the Country – imports are costly and cannot be guaranteed, especially with Brexit looming</li> <li>• Building on undeveloped land causes flooding. When land is covered by concrete/tarmac the surface water runs off and has to go somewhere. Broadwaters is already prone to flooding by the park, building at the top of the hill can only make this worse</li> <li>• Green spaces and farmland are important habitats for wildlife, some species of which are rare/endangered. From my garden I have personally seen deer, grass snakes and bats. Bats are a common sight in the evening – during the last few years I have found a dead long-eared bat and a horseshoe bat in my garden so I know for certain that those species live in the Hurcott area.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Kidderminster’s infrastructure cannot cope with this expansion – schools, doctors, dentists and roads are insufficient. Numerous schools in the town have been closed over the last 10-15 years – presumably the Council decided they were undersubscribed. Which is the mistake? Short sighted decision then or the apparently imminent population explosion now?</p> <p>Kidderminster Hospital has been downgraded. The closest A&amp;E department is now a 45 minute drive from the town. This will cost lives in times of emergency.</p> <p>Urban sprawl on the scale proposed is not in keeping with Kidderminster’s semi-rural character. 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. 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.</p> <p>Properties on the Silverwoods development remain unsold; why is there now a need for such massive development when there appears to be insufficient demand already? This huge building project was supposed to solve Kidderminster’s housing needs for the foreseeable future. Once again this contradicts decisions made by the Planners. Was the mistake then or now?</p> <p>There are not enough jobs in the area to support this huge influx of people. This will render new developments commuter ghost towns and increase traffic on main roads.</p> <p>I believe Kidderminster should use all of its brownfield sites before any further destruction of green sites is even considered. There are numerous factory sites and sites where schools have been closed – apparently these schools were not required but now they are needed again to support the massive expansion plans! The site at Sion Hill has planning permission but is still lying</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>derelict. Crown House in the town centre is an eyesore and could be used, as well as the plethora of empty shops and offices in the town. This would rejuvenate the town centre; at the moment it is dying.</p> <p>To summarise, I do not agree with Plan A or Plan B. I believe there is no need for such urban expansion.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04378</a>	Option B	Object	I am strongly opposed to the Options suggested. The district Council is not trying hard enough to use the brownfield sites that are available.
	<a href="#">LPP04385</a>	Option B	Object	I have to object as neither are viable options. Option B is totally unsustainable in that it places a lot of additional development the wrong side of the river in Stourport-on-Severn, creating increased traffic pressure on the bridge, pressure on existing schools in Areley Kings and there is little provision for shopping nor any medical provision that side of the river. With no alternative river crossing or by-pass in prospect, this cannot be a serious proposition as the existing infrastructure cannot sustain further development.
	<a href="#">LPP04389</a>	Option B	Object	None of these options but another option
	<a href="#">LPP04395</a>	Option B	Object	Object to option B, lack of infrastructure and to the use of any Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPP04410</a>	Option B	Object	<p>Object to option B as its Green Belt; brownfield sites should be considered first. Local infrastructure - roads, traffic, schools, doctors insufficient/local hospital has no A&amp;E.</p> <p>Kidderminster town centre is worst it's ever been half the shops are empty/rates are high.</p> <p>Houses could be built on former Glades old site, Park Lane, Mill Street, the old PO and above the shops in the town centre. As £1.4 million was spent on renovating 3 derelict cottages in the Horsefair then we should do so before touching Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04413</a>	Option B	Object	I do not support option B. I would urge you to consider the requirements of local residents,

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				rather than those of large developers in this plan.  As well as the implications of destroying the local countryside, which is well used and loved by the local community. Have a look at brownfield sites first.
	<a href="#">LPP04426</a>	Option B	Object	I object to the B proposals as you are putting forward an option to build on prime farming land, which has very diverse wildlife on it, (including protected species such as bats, badgers and great crested newts), and also concentrating too many houses on the east of Kidderminster, overwhelming the existing communities which could cause social problems further down the line.
	<a href="#">LPP04427</a>	Option B	Object	My objections relate 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.
	<a href="#">LPP04433</a>	Option B	Object	Object instead re use of Brownfield sites and town centre rejuvenation.
	<a href="#">LPP04435</a>	Option B	Object	I am writing to strongly object to the building of extra housing as explained under the draft Local Plan Preferred Options A and B. My reasons are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The population of Kidderminster over the last few years has remained fairly static and this proposal will unnecessarily attract more people into a market town that is currently ill equipped to handle such an influx.</li> <li>• Both Options will involve the loss of a tremendous amount of Green Belt and agricultural working farm land. Option A would be far more disastrous, and would also result in the loss of wildlife in the nearby woodland areas. I believe the Council has a duty to protect these Green Belt areas and the wild life that lives there for future generations.</li> <li>• Loss of local footpaths and bridleways, where many of the local residents and indeed schoolchildren spend recreational time, and indeed is the very reason why many people</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>have chosen to live here!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The building of houses under Option A, and to a lesser extent Option B, will cause the loss of the natural break from the other nearby communities, creating an ugly urban sprawl and eat into the lungs of Kidderminster. Furthermore, additional 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 which can only get worse, requiring additional Council spend.</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 and sufficient amenities for healthcare would be actually provided?</li> <li>• With BREXIT looming and the uncertainty that it will bring to the ability to forecast public spending, how can the Council justify increased expenditure on infrastructure and services necessary to support an expanded community, without jeopardising their ability to remain in office?</li> <li>• What Job opportunities are available for an increased population in a run down and depleting Kidderminster, where shops and businesses are closing at an alarming rate? Could this mean that eventually people will want to move away from Kidderminster to seek employment, ultimately defeating the object of attracting them there in the first place?</li> </ul> <p>I urge the council to throw out both Option A and B, not to destroy beautiful Green Belt and wildlife areas that can never be replaced, and to spend the money primarily on regenerating a rundown Town Centre. However, if it is proved to be a definite need for additional housing, then reluctantly Option B would be my preference.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4738</a>	Option B	Object	Do I prefer Option A or B? The immediate answer is neither. The amount of land taken up by these two proposals especially the core sites is too extreme. The amount of additional infrastructure required for schools, health facilities etc. looks from this perspective to be too costly and will never be completed. Where are these additional schools or Form Entry (not sure what this means) to be built within this new development without compromising all the other factors such as green infrastructure, transport, water and sewage etc? What about the unique place and all the other considerations?
	<a href="#">LPPO3182</a>	Option B	Support	<p>It would involve the loss of less Green Belt land together with all the wildlife that goes with it</p> <p>It would deprive the locality of less good quality agricultural land</p> <p>A dispersed strategy is good as the affect of new development would be spread more evenly around the district</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3081</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I am writing to notify you of <b>my preference for Option B</b> with regards to the two options for the proposed housing development in Kidderminster. I am concerned that the preference for Option A (involving the removal of protected green-belt) is not the best course of action for Kidderminster or its existing population. Furthermore, the scale of the development seems to have been based on pre-recession data during stronger growth, and as such does not represent the best interests or realities of the area.</p> <p>There are plenty of such alternate locations waiting for development in the Wyre Forest area, which have the added benefits of existing infrastructure. This in turn would result in an injection of demand to the stagnating town centre economies. <b>Option B details the type of change that would benefit the local area in the long run.</b></p> <p>Developing green-belt must always be a last resort. It is often argued that the UK needs more housing to meet the historically growing demand, but before merging towns like Kidderminster with villages like Stone and Stanklyn (destroying vital countryside and farmland in the process) all</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>other options must be exhausted. In this case, other options <i>are</i> available and are clearly favoured by the majority of the local electorate. Last year’s Brexit vote set in motion changes that are already impacting the UK population growth and industry and the UK’s agricultural sector will need to be maintained and developed in order to thrive under these challenging times. Removing a belt of highly productive land from Kidderminster is economic self-harm in these circumstances, not to mention the negative health consequences of destroying available countryside and replacing it with new roads. Developing central urban areas makes much more sense on all counts.</p> <p>Aside from the ecological, agricultural and health benefits mentioned above, there are practical benefits of developing brownfield sites. In the past, these sites were part of the life-blood of our towns—connected to the arteries, nerves and hearts of areas like Kidderminster. The local economy is prepared to quickly reconnect with transport links and infrastructure (physical and digital), ready to resuscitate then regrow these brownfield sites. The aforementioned injection of much-needed demand in recently neglected areas will benefit towns like Kidderminster, building momentum in an area that has struggled since the great recession of 2008. Building on Birmingham’s recent success, train-linked Kidderminster can then ensure that new money is spent locally, rather than bleeding off into places like Worcester (especially likely given that Option A is located on the Worcester road).</p> <p>My fear is that any preference for Option A is clearly not in locals’ long-term interests, irreparably damaging Kidderminster. Please make the right choice and select Option B.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3060</a>	Option B	Support	I support option B, because it already has existing development, it would have less impact on newly housing and there are schools which can support further development in the area.
	<a href="#">LPPO3167</a>	Option B	Support	I would support choosing Option B.
	<a href="#">LPPO3171</a>	Option B	Support	The route seems to cause the least disruption to roads and the lesser burden to other infrastructure such as medical facilities.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>A new school would not be needed; there are spaces available in schools in Wyre Forest.</p> <p>The money would be better spent on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing rents and parking charges to attract new business and visitors</li> <li>• building an attractive cinema and bowling alley</li> <li>• Providing free shuttle buses to and from successful sites such as SVR, Safari Park and Leisure Centre.</li> </ul> <p>Stourport and Bewdley need additional bridges for traffic and pedestrians.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP020</a>	Option B	Support	Supports Option B. Once Green Belt is lost it is gone forever. There may not currently be enough brownfield sites to meet projected needs, as time goes by, and ways of trading/manufacture change, who can say there will not be more available.
	<a href="#">LPP023</a>	Option B	Support	Supports option B
	<a href="#">LPP0112</a>	Option B	Support	Option B' is my preferred choice, if sufficient brown field sites can not be found
	<a href="#">LPP0189</a>	Option B	Support	I think Option B is the better solution, giving a more even distribution of housing around the whole of Kidderminster, and regenerating the old ugly derelict buildings around the area making Kidderminster a more pleasant place to live.
	<a href="#">LPP0678</a>	Option B	Support	<p>Reluctantly support Option B but re-examine all brownfield sites For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transform redundant buildings, behind Matalan to vibrant, affordable apartments</li> <li>2. Are industrial units on the “ex British Sugar” development needed - there appears to be excess capacity at Easter Park and adjacent Trading Estate. Could additional housing be made available on this site?</li> </ol> <p>If small, commercial unit capability is required convert the Kidderminster Town Area, ex-Woolworths location (with many adjacent empty shops), to a Trades and Skills area; i.e. a</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				location where businesses can pursue their trades, but also demonstrate them to the public/visitors? Kidderminster Town Centre could become a balance of retail, entertainment (bars, cafes) and Trades/Skills. A centre for educational (college) and vocational training.  Could the area next to Tescos in Stourport be used for apartments/housing?
Stone Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1159</a>	Option B	Support	Stone Parish Council supports Option B.
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1029</a>	Option B	Support	Parish Council supports option B. Impact on western settlements could be reduced by using option A site near Lea Castle. This may assist with plans for relief road. Plan appears to propose a relief road running through a new residential estate which would make it an unattractive place to live. Large eastern extension would have to be carefully controlled so that it made a positive contribution to quality design and local distinctiveness. Consider that option B would give greater opportunity for quality design and local distinctiveness.  Both options will have major impact on traffic volumes heading east out of district. Junctions at Mustow Green and Hagley will need improving. Detailed discussions will be required with County.
	<a href="#">LPPO2255</a>	Option B	Support	Under Option B with the development of the Lea Castle site where the infrastructure is already in place, if 1000 homes were built a new school would be built to accommodate the children from the area. Heronswood School is unable to increase in size as it has no available land around. Lea Castle site would also be somewhat screened with the woodland areas already present which would have less impact on the area.  For my reasons given I oppose option A and favour option B
	<a href="#">LPPO2261</a>	Option B	Support	I believe the best policy for Wyre Forest would be Option B where the proposed building etc. would be confined to infill and keeping the current boundaries of the area.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				I favour Option B as I think all of Wyre Forest should share the increase in housing but that the Council should firstly build on all available brownfield sites and insist on regeneration of empty properties into housing. They should lobby Parliament to change any laws to ensure landowners do not keep empty properties which are detrimental to the local area e.g. Crown House and Worcester Street. All planning permission already granted to developers should be developed quickly and without delays, planning permission should be given with a clause that building must be completed within a period of time for instance 3 years.
	<a href="#">LPP01876</a>	Option B	Support	We feel strongly that it should be Option B.  Option B is less extreme, less impact in any one area. .
Spennells Against Further Expansion	<a href="#">LPP01743</a>	Option B	Support	Of the two choices in the Local Plan we would choose <b>Option B</b> because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less Green Belt land would be used</li> <li>• Ability to build a greater number of houses, in areas where they are needed for local expansion.</li> <li>• The dispersed nature of the development would result in less pollution and less strain upon Kidderminster’s existing infrastructure. Spreading development would serve the needs of expanding local communities by creating the potential for more housing development, but without concentrating the development to the detriment of the Green Belt cushion between the Wyre Forest and the West Midlands conurbation.</li> </ul>
Summerfield Against Land Transformation	<a href="#">LPP01624</a>	Option B	Support	We reluctantly support Option B because of the lower Green Belt land take and the lesser disadvantage to the Summerfield (and Spennells) community.
	<a href="#">LPP03049</a>	Option B	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option B uses less Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Option B plans for a larger number of houses, in areas where they reflect the local need.</li> <li>• The dispersed nature of development in Option B would result in less strain upon</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Kidderminster’s infrastructure and allow other communities to retain their own infrastructure to the benefit of their residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option B does not require the additional policing costs suggested in section 4.4.9of the WFIDP.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3057</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I believe there are a number of Brownfield sites in Kidderminster and the surrounding areas that could and should be used first.</p> <p>Kidderminster town centre itself has a number of opportunities for housing development and the existing infrastructure to support the building of residential units.</p> <p>New housing in the town centre could breathe new life into the depleted high street rather than moving people further away onto Green Belt land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3026</a>	Option B	Support	<p><b>My opinion is that we should adopt Option B</b>, the continued development of brownfield sites across the district <b>as and when required</b>.</p> <p>Conclusion: There is too much uncertainty to justify the irrevocable destruction of our Green Belt.</p> <p>Therefore I believe that <b>Option B</b> with the continued development of brownfield sites across the district <b>as and when required</b> is the correct decision.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2997</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I prefer Option B as it uses 20% less Green Belt. I also believe that that there are other avenues which have not be considered and have been missed from your documentation without clear explanation. I also believe it is important to look at the actual figures in terms of population and what this area needs.</p> <p>I recommend Option B is followed utilising brownfield sites as a priority; only then that Green</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Belt is used once brownfield sites have all been developed and exhausted.</p> <p>It was also pleasing to hear Councillor Ian Hardiman on TV state that the Council had brownfield sites for 3000 dwellings, so the use of Green Belt should be a last resort. It was important to hear this and to prioritise these areas as approximately 3000 dwellings meets the need for this District. *3582 dwelling as calculated by using the SNPP projections would mean that brownfield sites can accommodate 83.74%.</p> <p>It was also encouraging to read that in your table for aims and objectives (3.02) that the District does want <i>"to protect and support the role of Green Belt through a strategic review"</i> so to lose the Green Belt agricultural land adjacent to the Spennells estate would be a substantially larger in option A, than that of Option B and with the projection figures of dwellings that can be sourced via brownfield sites Option B is more favourable and would <i>"identify limited strategic Green Belt release to enable the delivery of the plan"</i>.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2909</a>	Option B	Support	<p>Prefers Option <b>B</b> as it uses 20% less Green Belt.</p> <p>The plan appears encourage building on the Green Belt, attracting commuters from Birmingham and Worcester.</p> <p>The road infrastructure needs addressing as Kidderminster is frequently gridlocked during rush hour, especially at the Wilden Lane/Worcester Road roundabout, which has been caused by the new link road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2985</a>	Option A	Support	<p>I broadly support Option A because I feel that the infrastructure gains are very important.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2915</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I write with regard to the above proposal with regards to the Green Belt land surrounding Spennells estate.</p> <p>In the report we are asked whether we prefer Option A or B. My opinion is that we should go</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				with Option B.  Option B would use less Green Belt land and there are ample brown field sites within the Wyre Forest area and especially within the Kidderminster town centre, which could be used for housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO2931</a>	Option B	Support	Option B, a more dispersed use, would mean catchment areas for schools doctors etc would not be pushed past a potential breaking point. There are many viable brownfield sites and also the half derelict town centre to consider.
	<a href="#">LPPO2950</a>	Option B	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses 20% less Green Belt land.</li> <li>• Does not involve Green Belt graded 'very good'. Towns &amp; Villages to retain their historical characteristics</li> <li>• Less likely to attract overspill from B'ham/Solihull, therefore genuinely can be said to meet local needs across the District.</li> <li>• Will not cause the major traffic congestion that will occur with Option A</li> <li>• Will not require the construction of the essential Option A relief roads</li> <li>• The various housing developments can run concurrently across the District, without major disruption, achieving the housing requirements more quickly.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2871</a>	Option B	Support	I support Option B
	<a href="#">LPPO2829</a>	Option B	Support	Do the benefits of dispersal strategy outweigh congestion in town centre?
	<a href="#">LPPO2678</a>	Option B	Support	<p>If the development of Wyre Forest (WF) is to be considered as a combination of residual, commercial and industrial phases, whilst still maintaining some credence to backing the surrounding 'Green Belt' (GB). Then in any statutory planning exercise there must be consideration, <u>as a first priority</u> given to any existing urban/'Brown-field' site (BFS) that has become available and apparently surplus to requirement.</p> <p>Let us now assume that this previously used BFS has been serviced with communications,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>drainage, power and water then the only restoration of such sites would be the requirements of an environmental impact study, minimal site groundworks preparation – (providing there was little/no contamination.) There is no potential similar servicing benefit with Option A.</p> <p>Since most of such BFS sites would attract domestic dwellings and maybe some small and medium enterprises (SME) then an increase in population/residents would invariably help to bring the town centres back to life. Another advantage would be that transportation improvements would not necessarily be at such a high premium, walking between services would be an advantage in the health of the populace as well. Use the developers to assist in the refurbishment of the centre of the three towns, we all know of developments that have had new roads provided to service their respective new properties. The hospital, three major GP's surgeries, train and bus terminals are all within walking distance in Kidderminster.</p> <p>When one considers the approximate annual requirement of 300 developments for the next 17 years spread over the whole district, there seems little need to go for the GB option, as proposed. Given that the BFS will only be able to absorb half of the statistical requirement, presumably over the 17 years, that is still circa 150 properties per annum. Which means that the '3 noted fields' adjoining the Spennells, is too big by far for the implementation of the annualised sum of developments over the 17 years. There must be smaller GB sites that could absorb the annualised requirement, that the 'numbers' seem to suggest. Without the impact that taking three adjacent GB fields, all to make a stretched Spennells, will have in that one area of Kidderminster.</p> <p>Which could easily be interpreted as the acquisition of three fields to take the planned development of 5500. If we now consider the size of development companies that have been named in the media then they could develop the three fields in well under 10 years. Which all of a sudden makes a mockery of 5500 house provision spread over 17 years in the WF, and changes the whole Local Plan to a Local Plan for the Development of Eastern Kidderminster specifically, so be honest if this is the underlying and probably the cheapest proposal say this is the preferred</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>option.</p> <p>It seems too easy to say what WFDC needs to appease some directive from Westminster and in the process overload the 'eastern' side of WF, when the need to develop the GB does not appear necessary in the time scale that the current study is quoting. This is where the 'Least Cost' option to WFDC or conversely being the recipient of the very best benefit package that could be extracted from the developers or other financing operation/ILA</p> <p>Given that the GB option would need the provision of the Eastern Kidderminster Relief Road (EKRR) from the A449 around Kidderminster to the A456, one has to wonder where the funding for that would come from. In which case all the other County Councillors would be arguing for own "Eastern Relief Road", that would likely take all of the 17 years to debate the funding of "Eastern Relief Road" wherever in the County it was going to go.</p> <p>So I say Option B – Development across the whole of Wyre Forest, is the way to go</p> <p>The facts are that since WFDC is apparently not in such a strong position, other than 'rubber stamping' any ideas of developing the whole of Wyre Forest that it will be forced to take the easy and cheapest option and disregard the rules that stipulate that communities should not be melded together, Spennells and Summerfield, Spennells and Stone. In other words load up the eastern side of Kidderminster and be done with it, all within one hit!</p> <p>I repeat develop the whole of WFDC – Option B</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2581</a></p>	<p>Option B</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>As a resident of Stone Parish I am extremely concerned about the prospect of using greenfield land together with potential loss of wildlife habitat, in our Parish for housing needs, which will seriously add to unjustifiable urban spread.</p> <p>I therefore wish to register my objections to the Local Area Plan by selecting <b>OPTION B</b>.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>I am at a loss to understand how the requirement for about 6,000 houses will be needed in the ensuing years especially in the present and indeed near to medium term future when the three towns forming Wyre Forest District are barely able to sustain employment levels as at present.</p> <p>The prospect of attracting new means of employment and therefore the sustainability and growth for the long term future in WFD, engenders a feeling of pessimism.</p> <p>Before all else certainly the needs for Healthcare, a viable Hospital with health care for all residents and the elderly, transportation and public services, roads infrastructure, Schools, Industry, commerce, retail, open space and leisure facilities, this with the background of an almost extinct Carpet industry a traditional employer of Wyre Forest residents.</p> <p>Any new housing certainly not at the proposed level could most probably be accommodated on brownfield site and via inner urban renewal and Core Option allocated land, surely when all of these sites are fully utilised, should there be a need to sequestrate greenfield land.</p> <p>Therefore I reiterate that <b>OPTION B</b> of the Local Area Plan is and should be the most sensible direction that Wyre Forest District Council must pursue.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2582</a>	Option B	Support	<p>As a resident of Stone Parish I am extremely concerned about the prospect of using Greenfield land together with potential loss of wildlife habitat, in our Parish for housing needs, which will seriously add to unjustifiable urban spread.</p> <p>I therefore wish to register my objections to the Local Area Plan by selecting <b>OPTION B</b>.</p> <p>I am at a loss to understand how the requirement for about 6,000 houses will be needed in the ensuing years especially in the present and indeed near to medium term future when the three towns forming Wyre Forest District are barely able to sustain employment levels as at present.</p> <p>The prospect of attracting new means of employment and therefore the sustainability and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>growth for the long term future in WFD, engenders a feeling of pessimism.</p> <p>Before all else certainly the needs for Healthcare, a viable Hospital with health care for all residents and the elderly, transportation and public services, roads infrastructure, Schools, Industry, commerce, retail, open space and leisure facilities, this with the background of an almost extinct Carpet industry a traditional employer of Wyre Forest residents.</p> <p>Any new housing certainly not at the proposed level could most probably be accommodated on brownfield site and via inner urban renewal and Core Option allocated land, surely when all of these sites are fully utilised, should there be a need to sequester greenfield land.</p> <p>Therefore I reiterate that <b>OPTION B</b> of the Local Area Plan is and should be the most sensible direction that Wyre Forest District Council must pursue.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2451</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I am very much in favour of Option B for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility. Dispersed development is more able to react to changes than one large scale development.</li> <li>• Diversity. Spreading the development across the district will allow Stourport, Bewdley et al to benefit rather than growing Kidderminster alone.</li> <li>• Environmental. We should be looking to reuse and redevelop rather than take away green field sites. Once they are gone, they will not come back.</li> <li>• Generational. If we are to keep young people in the district we need housing to suit them. Town centre would be ideal, and would contribute to town centre regeneration.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2166</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I do feel development does need to be spread out throughout Wyre Forest; not just on the eastern edge of Kidderminster which already has the brunt of the core housing. Hence, in addition to my other comments , I would choose <b>Option B</b>.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2329</a>	Option B	Support	<p><b>I personally prefer Option B</b> provided the brownfield sites are used first and a larger housing</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				estate is built at Lea Castle where there is currently some housing. Looking at the core development site in appendix A, an estate similar or of a similar size to Spennells could be built without causing too much intrusion on the approach to Kidderminster from Wolverhampton or Stourbridge. It would of course need careful planning. The area adjacent to the Stourbridge Road which is currently classed as Green Belt should only be reclassified as a last resort should the need arise.  I therefore prefer Option B and object to Option A.
	<a href="#">LPPO2296</a>	Option B	Support	Benefits of a more dispersed strategy most definitely outweigh the disadvantages of not supporting the relief road or easier school provision.
	<a href="#">LPPO2366</a>	Option B	Support	My preferred option is B
	<a href="#">LPPO4231</a>	Option B	Support	OPTION B IS BETTER
	<a href="#">LPPO4178</a>	Option B	Support	I feel that the District Council should adopt Plan B on the Kidderminster side of the river, where access from the main roads is a lot easier & people living on any development on these sites would be able if they wanted to easily walk into town to use the facilities.
	<a href="#">LPPO4150</a>	Option B	Support	Support Option B sites as there is much less requirement for the use of Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPPO4070</a>	Option B	Support	Therefore I support option B due to the fact that less Green Belt land is affected.
	<a href="#">LPPO3832</a>	Option B	Support	I prefer Option B as it utilises 20% less Green Belt land and object strongly to Option A.
	<a href="#">LPPO3803</a>	Option B	Support	I object to the Council's strategy as evidence shows that the scale is unnecessary. <b>I prefer Option B</b> notwithstanding I object to the analysis leading to the unnecessary scale of development.  The Council needs to think in other directions rather than to pursue an unwanted eastern bypass that would cause negative effects to outweigh any perceived benefit.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3665</a>	Option B	Support	Option B is the preferred choice as this road will not be required and it uses less Green Belt.  The benefits of a more dispersed strategy do outweigh the disadvantages of not supporting the relief road or easier school provision. More on brownfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO3747</a>	Option B	Support	Regarding the proposed new housing development to the East of Kidderminster, I have looked at the relevant plans and consider that Option B is the better Proposal.  I am also very pleased to see that there is a proposal to convert the 1902 built former Warehouse in Churchfields (opposite the CMS Dealer's premises) into housing apartments.
	<a href="#">LPPO3776</a>	Option B	Support	Having studied the points behind the above review I would personally recommend that you support Option B.  Plan B does seem more acceptable especially as promises have been made to improve the infrastructure.
	<a href="#">LPPO3614</a>	Option B	Support	I would like to show that my preferred option to be <b>Option B</b> and also my objections to the LP and my views, on how it is a flawed document.  So to clarify I am stating my preferred option to be <b>OPTION B</b> but I want it to be noted, I am objecting to all building including the core housing which features in both options, and to the <u>Wyre Forest District Council Local Plan 2016-2034</u> as a whole.
	<a href="#">LPPO3574</a>	Option B	Support	Option B has a lower concentration of dwellings and spreads the development over a wider area. This will have a lower impact on transport, schools and other local services.  Option B spreads any increase in dwellings around the district, and concentrating particularly on the Lea Castle brownfield site for dwellings appears to meet the actual growth in population.
	<a href="#">LPPO3475</a>	Option B	Support	This option will spread housing and employment zones around the area helping to boost the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>economy.</p> <p>Local facilities such as doctors, dentists and schools in each town will then be able to absorb people more easily.</p> <p>People will also be able to integrate more easily into the local community rather than becoming a satellite estate on the outskirts.</p> <p>Option B will lead to shorter car journeys for people to travel to their work, schools and shops.</p> <p>More children being able to walk to school.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3398</a>	Option B	Support	<p>Option B would be the lesser of two evils, if linked to the planned development for housing at the old Lea Castle Hospital site. This would involve far less Green Belt land having to be destroyed and would be very much fairer to spread new housing in smaller pockets around the district rather than dump it all alongside one already built-up area at Spennells.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3217</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I support Option B as my preferred option, and oppose Option A, as option B requires the use of less Green Belt and is a far more dispersed development to allow more people to choose where they live in the Wyre forest.</p> <p>Many younger people and families are wanting the flexibility to live in the more vibrant, green and social areas of the Wyre Forest such as Bewdley, Stourport and Cookley, and live near friends and family, rather than move out to mass housing estates in Kidderminster. There is currently not enough affordable housing in these areas, which Option B would address.</p> <p>I support Option B albeit land at Captains Pool should also not be developed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4532</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I believe option B is more beneficial to Kidderminster and offers the opportunity to revitalise the town by removal of derelict / unused buildings and replacing them with housing either through the conversion of the current buildings or new build properties. The most obvious example is</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>resultant of the town centre moving down a street through the creation of Weavers Wharf which has left Worcester Street as an eyesore that gives a negative impression of our town. The building of housing on the land between Worcester Street &amp; Bromsgrove Street (from Coventry St to Prospect Hill) &amp; the demolition of the old Littlewoods &amp; Woolworths buildings would bring people closer to the town, improve footfall for local business and at the same time clear away / rejuvenate a dead area of the town. I am sure as part of this process many other examples will be provided by residents of areas of the town that could be positively improved by open minded thinking around option B.</p> <p>The core housing plan combined with option B will have less of a negative impact on the area and careful consideration of how the core housing sites are utilised could reduce this impact further. The creation of a village on the Lea Castle Hospital site (core housing site) with more than the proposed 600 homes would spread the pressure on the area road network more evenly, reduce the need for unnecessary Green Belt development and provide the creation of a new community and business opportunity for local shops and services.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPP04589</a></p>	<p>Option B</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>The Local Plan Review Preferred Options Document asks that we consider if we prefer Option A or B to cater for WFDC plans to accommodate increased population up to 2034 and the required housing and employment needs; and presumably the infrastructure needs including roads, public and private transport, schools, medical services, hospitals and policing.</p> <p>In broad terms the main differences between the two options is that:-</p> <p>Option A concentrates the vast majority of the housing towards the east of Kidderminster building on a vast amount of the Green Belt, making Spennells a “Super Estate”; where Option B disperses the build across Brown Field sites and Green Belt around Kidderminster, using approximately 20% less Green Belt.</p> <p><b><u>We of course support Option B but with a more realistic numbers of dwellings built as outlined in this objection.</u></b></p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04465</a>	Option B	Support	<p>In relation to the proposed developments on Spennells Green Belt we are simply asked do we prefer Option A or B. In simple terms I prefer Option B as it uses 20% less Green Belt but you will see I also have other views/ideas.</p> <p>I recommend Option B is followed but Green Belt is only used after existing Brown Field sites have been developed.</p> <p>Other reasons for preferring Option B is that the Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (WFIDP) identifies additional Policing costs for Option A (section 4.4.9). Also, Option B does not need as much roadwork and section 7.0.12 of the same report says " 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." This will save £17.5m per the report.</p> <p>This is recommended in the WFIDP in section 3:</p> <p>"It should be noted that the expanded Lea Castle site within Option B is preferable to the smaller allocation identified in Option A. This expanded site has the potential to include additional development opportunities such as retail and a new primary school which will assist in providing a more sustainable development. This expanded site also allows the potential for a further access from the site onto the A451. However, it should be noted the A451 is a fast road that has historically suffered from a high accident rate so care would need to be taken when considering any access."</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04450</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I feel that many of the aims for the future of our local area are good. However, while I appreciate the need for the local council to make adequate provision for future housing, both for local people seeking affordable homes (including those seeking social housing) and to provide <b>some</b> housing which will encourage higher wage earners to move into the area, <b>I do not feel that Option A meets this need and that Option B would be preferable.</b></p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>In the past the local council has shown lack of vision in planning. I fear that Option A shows further lack of vision and seeks to doom Kidderminster to becoming a dormitory town for Birmingham without the necessary infrastructure to support it. My views are not based upon 'Not in my backyard' but because I care about the preservation of Green Belt and realistic improvement of the local area for local people.</p> <p>My main concern is that presenting developers with the opportunity to build upon green field sites, currently outside of the Green Belt, will lead to urban sprawl to the southeast of Kidderminster, while brown field sites within the area remain undeveloped.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04451</a>	Option B	Support	Preference for Option B.
	<a href="#">LPP04414</a>	Option B	Support	Supports option B.
	<a href="#">LPP04302</a>	Option B	Support	I think Option B is preferable
	<a href="#">LPP04306</a>	Option B	Support	Option B would be less impact in the area as it is mainly infill on areas already surrounded with properties and buildings.
	<a href="#">LPP04309</a>	Option B	Support	I choose Option B.
	<a href="#">LPP04262</a>	Option B	Support	<p>Prefer Option B.</p> <p>The dispersed strategy would have less impact but there have already been concentrated development of housing in The Horsefair, the Sugar Beet Site, Stourport Basin. Kidderminster would struggle to successfully become richer since it is further from motorways and transport routes. It is the semi-rural/rural nature of the town and housing which appeals to newcomers. School provision must always have the ability to fluctuate to demand for places.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04292</a>	Option B	Support	<p>Supports Option B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It offers sufficient housing and commercial/industrial development opportunity to meet</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>the needs of the District with the least impact on the environment, agriculture and infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It has a lower concentration of dwellings, spreading the development over a wider area, which should have a lower impact on transport, schools, and other services. Being more widespread covers the catchment area of additional schools.</li> <li>• It uses less Green Belt and agricultural land and more brownfield sites such as the old Lea Castle Hospital site.</li> <li>• It is less likely to result in loss of local identity and merging of towns/communities, due to the wider spread of housing development.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPP04640</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I prefer Option B as it uses 20% less Green Belt with comment as follows:</p> <p>Option B does not need as much roadwork</p> <p>In the Green Belt review some of the assessment is wrong and coalescence will occur if Option A is pursued.</p> <p>The WFIDP identifies additional Policing costs for Option A. Large estates have evidenced increased anti social behaviour/crime rates acknowledged in the WFIDP but in the Local Plan consultation.</p> <p>The WFIDP and the Local Plan are very light on the provision of medical services.</p> <p>It is recommended the expanded Lea Castle site within Option B is transferred to Option A. Should Option A be chosen I support the more sustainable Lea Castle site to inc further access</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04627</a>	Option B	Support	<p>Option B would be a better proposal as it spreads the houses around and not pushing Kidderminster houses further away from the town centre which would mean cars would be required to get into town as opposed to walking. Why does Kidderminster need so many new</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				houses?
	<a href="#">LPP04759</a>	Option B	Support	Access to other Green Belt areas identified as 'core' sites included in Option B, between Stourbridge Road and Bromsgrove Road can be easily accessed, at a fraction of the cost, (a) from Stourbridge Road and/or Birmingham Road, and (b) from Birmingham Road (via a new junction on Husum Way opposite Shakespeare Drive) and/or via the Stourminster School site. Neither of these potential areas of land, albeit existing Green Belt, would require a major trunk road completed to make them suitable for development.
	<a href="#">LPP04773</a>	Option B	Support	I believe the best policy for Wyre Forest is option B where the proposed building etc would be confined to infill and keeping the current boundaries of the area. Option B is preferred as all of Wyre Forest should share the increase in housing. For the valid reasons stated it is my belief that any proposed building should be kept within the footprint already here, my preference is option B
	<a href="#">LPP04712</a>	Option B	Support	<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>Having read the information concerning economic social and environmental issues, I feel that on balance Option B would be the better option for future developments in the Wyre forest.</p> <p>Firstly, in relation to economic issues, I note that there has been a reduction in employment opportunities in the area, due to decline of traditional manufacturing industries. The static population growth and a high degree of economic dependency due to the ageing population, together with a low level of in migration, have produced the need to attract an economically active population to the area.</p> <p>If this premise is correct i.e. that the district needs to attract economically active commuters from other areas to address this imbalance and the assumption that they are less likely to have found employment in the local area than in Worcester or the West Midlands conurbation, then of the two main sites proposed Option B would be much more suitable. The site to the south of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				<p>Stourport would give access to the main roads to Worcester without passing through Kidderminster and furthermore it is not in the Green Belt. There are only two short stretches of footpath in this area to the south west of the B4194 and access to wooded countryside of Areley and Ribbesford Wood would not be obstructed. The other site to the north of Kidderminster along the A451 would also unlikely to add any extra through traffic, as it would attract commuters bound for Halesowen, Stourbridge and Birmingham. It also adjoins an existing core site around Lea Castle.</p> <p>The other sites in option B are small and could be adapted to local needs in Cookley, Fairfield and Bewdley, provided there are no environmental objections. This would take into account the needs of an increasingly elderly population throughout the district who would suffer if they were separated by long distances from their families and local services.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04922</a>	Option B	Support	<p>In relation to the proposed developments on Spennells Green Belt we are simply asked do we prefer Option A or B. In simple terms I prefer Option B as it uses 20% less Green Belt but you will see I also have other views/ideas.</p> <p>I recommend Option B is followed but Green Belt is only used after existing Brown Field sites have been developed.</p> <p>Other reasons for preferring Option B is that the Wyre Forest Infrastructure Delivery Plan (WFIDP) identifies additional Policing costs for Option A (section 4.4.9). Also, Option B does not need as much roadwork and section 7.0.12 of the same report says " 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." This will save £17.5m per the report.</p> <p>This is recommended in the WFIDP in section 3:</p> <p>"It should be noted that the expanded Lea Castle site within Option B is preferable to the smaller</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
				allocation identified in Option A. This expanded site has the potential to include additional development opportunities such as retail and a new primary school which will assist in providing a more sustainable development. This expanded site also allows the potential for a further access from the site onto the A451. However, it should be noted the A451 is a fast road that has historically suffered from a high accident rate so care would need to be taken when considering any access.”
	<a href="#">LPPO5075</a>	Option B	Support	<p>I support the proposed Option B. Option B also removes around 48 hectares Less Green Belt than option A which is a very important and essential point that I wish to make. Green Belt should be protected wherever possible for future generations and current generations to enjoy and cultivate.</p> <p>The dispersed nature of the development would result in less pollution and less strain upon Kidderminster’s existing infrastructure which is already struggling to cope. This would spread the development more evenly around Wyre Forest, serving the needs of expanding local communities by creating the potential for more housing development and enabling people to choose where they want to live.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5076</a>	Option B	Support	I therefore reluctantly support the proposed Option B, but request no Green Belt is removed or re-designated until every brownfield site already allocated in the plan in Kidderminster has been built on over the next 12 years or more.
	<a href="#">LPPO5081</a>	Option B	Support	After the use of brownfield sites, I reluctantly support Option B. This uses less Green Belt land and it will spread housing and employment zones throughout Kidderminster, Stourport and Bewdley providing an economic boost to all the towns. It will also help people make shorter car journeys to work, school and shops leading to less congestion. I believe the three towns and surrounding rural areas can more easily absorb the numbers of extra people into doctor’s surgeries and children into local primary and secondary schools, rather than concentrate them on the Eastern part of Kidderminster. Hopefully more children would then be able to walk to school.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPHS 6.54–6.56**

Company / Organisation	Response No	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPP04844</a>	Option B	Support	Disperse development around the district to ensure an equitable spread.
	<a href="#">LPP04845</a>	Option B	Support	My preference is for Option B.
	<a href="#">LPP04866</a>	Option B	Support	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.
	<a href="#">LPP05115</a>	6.56	Support	Prefer Option B.  The dispersed strategy would have less impact but there have already been concentrated development of housing in The Horsefair, the Sugar Beet Site, Stourport Basin. Kidderminster would struggle to successfully become richer since it is further from motorways and transport routes. It is the semi-rural/rural nature of the town and housing which appeals to newcomers. School provision must always have the ability to fluctuate to demand for places.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO6</a>	Site submitted - Yew Tree Walk, Stourport	Comment	Suggests site AKR/18 - Yew Tree walk, Stourport. It is immediately available available for increased levels of affordable housing or an entirely affordable scheme.
	<a href="#">LPPO7</a>	Site submitted - Habberley Road, Kidderminster	Comment	New site submitted for consideration - Habberley Road, Kidderminster
	<a href="#">LPPO64</a>	Alternative sites	Comment	Alternatives. There are lots of empty disused buildings around Kidderminster which could be developed, all the empty shops. Crown House, Industrial buildings built and still left empty and old units left empty because cheaper units can be found elsewhere. Why take farm land when there are so many derelict and unused places?
	<a href="#">LPPO101</a>	Alternative sites	Comment	Old Leisure Centre site, ideal for town centre living being within walking distance of rail and bus stations.  Re-develop Horsefair area, which is a total disgrace to Kidderminster and is close to town centre.  Alternative which appears to have been over looked is the Burlish Park Golf course which is now closed and is now a waste land. I am under the impression that Wyre Forest owns this land, although I might be wrong. This area is close to bus routes and employment areas and covers a large expanse of land.
	<a href="#">LPPO111</a>	Alternative sites	Comment	Developing Green Belt land should only be considered as a last resort if all other options have been exhausted. There are many Brownfield sites in the Wyre Forest area that should be considered first, like the closed down carpet factories, redundant warehouses that litter this area, the failed Wyre Forest golf club off Zortech avenue and the old Ceramaspeed factory, next door, which is far too large for any prospective manufacturer in this area to ever use again as a factory.
	<a href="#">LPPO122</a>	Alternative sites	Comment	Consideration should be given to the land at Burlish, until recently a golf course.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				This is poor agricultural land.
	<a href="#">LPPO183</a>		Comment	Yes. Education provision will improve by more schools increasing capacity. Pollution can be solved easier by keeping Green Belt and appropriate tree planting. Improvements to traffic flow by appropriate route signage.
	<a href="#">LPPO198</a>	Alternative sites - Town Centre	Comment	Our town centre is a ghost town, with the majority of retail units standing empty and the others mainly charity shops. A considerable amount of money was spent by the council changing the block paving and seating available, this has in no way regenerated the town centre or encouraged any new commercial enterprises either retail or otherwise. Would the land not be better used for creating housing?
	<a href="#">LPPO228</a>	Alternatives - Kidderminster Town Centre	Comment	Kidderminster once a vibrant beautiful Town has dwindled and decayed. We <u>must think</u> of the future how best to make Kidderminster a pleasant & welcoming place to live.  We should prioritise on improving and rejuvenating the town centre maximising areas such as brownfield sites first before we look to alternatives such as the fields around Spennells. I do not accept that we have to take green fields away.
	<a href="#">LPPO230</a>	Alternatives - Kidderminster Town	Comment	Kidderminster town centre needs regeneration and improvement. I avoid its empty shops, graffiti and derelict buildings. Refurbishing and developing Kidderminster town would be an excellent opportunity to bring the once beautiful buildings back to life.
	<a href="#">LPPO310</a>	Site submitted - Land at Puxton, Kidderminster	Comment	Suggests land at Puxton (WFR/WC/21) is included in the plan for housing.
Tooby Family	<a href="#">LPPO318</a>	Site submitted - Land at Gaymore Farm, Cookley	Comment	There is no new land allocated for housing in Cookley Village up to 2034. This is not “robust” planning as the village has a considerable base population and the density of built form is unlikely to lead to many “windfall” sites even if the garden land policy is eased. Given that a Housing Needs Survey will be completed in

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				2017/18 it would be prudent to zone land for phased release. My clients site (WFR/WC/5) is preferable to the ADR as it does not close the strategic gap with the Lea Castle Hospital site (WFR/WC/15). By moving the Green Belt eastwards to the track alongside WFR/WC/5 a clearly defensible new boundary would be created.
	<a href="#">LPPO353</a>	Site submitted - Land at Ridge End, Bewdley Hill	Comment	Suggests new site: East field near Ridge End, Bewdley Hill, Kidderminster
	<a href="#">LPPO427</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>I object to Option A and Option B. Green Belt land should be used only as a VERY LAST RESORT.</p> <p>Wyre Forest, Greater Birmingham, Solihull and Worcestershire should collaborate and collectively review overall brownfield site availability and plan housing development accordingly – decisions to build on the Green Belt should not be based on local authority boundaries.</p> <p>The 5 year rolling time frame for construction sites should allow for regular reviews of brownfield sites and enable changes to be incorporated into any plan,.</p> <p>The plan fails to recognise changes in shopping habits and unrealistically targets retail expansion and comparison shopping.</p> <p>Kidderminster has suffered from the failure to 'tidy up' following the migration of Kidderminster town centre to Weavers Wharf and Crossley Retail Park.</p> <p>Retail premises and the courts building have been empty for 8 /9 years - the regeneration of such sites require radical solutions for alternative use that reduce any need to build on the Green Belt.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Unnecessary decisions are being taken now e.g. in 1999 who could have predicted the impacts of the 2007/08 economic collapse or changes caused by online shopping (indeed, the plan itself demonstrates an inability to predict /understand short term population levels in the District).</p> <p>The plan fails in its stated aim to "to use a robust and up-to-date evidence base to ensure that the local plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area" . Instead it aims to justify what developers want to deliver rather than meet the needs of Kidderminster residents.</p> <p>Previous attempts to build an Eastern relief road have failed - the plan fails to present evidence based data that supports it in economic or environmental terms - at the consultation session I was informed this would be a single carriageway 40 mph road following the same route as the existing road from the Worcester Road through Mustow Green to the Birmingham Road - is it really a relief road at all?</p> <p>Whilst constructing a new school in the Spennells area appears attractive this (together with the promise of the 'relief road' shouldn't be the determining factor when opting to build on the Green Belt – other options should be sought.</p> <p>Many people commute into / and out of Kidderminster now (hence the railway station development) - and have done so for many years. This situation equally relates to the areas covered by the LEPs identified in the plan.</p> <p>Whilst economic development in Kidderminster will be welcome - past experience shows this will take time – in the meantime people will continue to travel.</p> <p>Immediate need is for fresh radical thinking that optimises the use of brownfield sites throughout the LEP areas for residential use and enables Kidderminster itself to become a modern, contained and attractive town centre that incorporates</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				retail leisure and residential opportunities rather than pursue outdated models from the past - 'mixed use' communicates little other than the elements of 'wishful thinking' so often reported in the local press over numerous years.
	<a href="#">LPPO464</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	Why cannot the lea castle site as a whole be developed between the A449 and Stourbridge road to the east this would give good infrastructure in the form of transport links and as this is already a major site will have the drainage , site is not within the east and south site flood plains. This could be developed to be self sufficient as there would be enough houses built to justify a new primary school and have local amenities constructed .If the land to the east and west of the current proposals were also developed this would allow a sustainable bus route, have access to the local secondary school in Wolverley and provide a sustainable community.
	<a href="#">LPPO465</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	Why cannot the lea castle site as a whole be developed between the A449 and Stourbridge road to the east this would give good infrastructure in the form of transport links and as this is already a major site will have the drainage, site is not within the east and south site flood plains. This could be developed to be self sufficient as there would be enough houses built to justify a new primary school and have local amenities constructed .If the land to the east and west of the current proposals were also developed this would allow a sustainable bus route, have access to the local secondary school in Wolverley and provide a sustainable community.
	<a href="#">LPPO466</a>	Alternative sites	Comment	Why are there no proposals for development on the North/West of Kidderminster? Can development opportunities be investigated at the rear of the existing Ferndale Estate?
	<a href="#">LPPO488</a>	Alternative site	Comment	A good use of Lea Castle Hospital site would be a 540 unit development for elderly persons with their own Doctors surgery. This would limit the extra vehicles that come out onto the A449 which is just before a dangerous bend.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO578</a>	Alternative sites	Support	<p>I support building on Lea Castle for the following reasons:</p> <p>Large number of dwellings would be on existing brownfield ground, and not reducing the amount of Green Belt land around the town. The size of the area could be further increased by using the land up to Axborough Lane.</p> <p>A large number of dwellings could support a 2 form entry primary school, thus reducing the impact on the local facilities.</p> <p>It would be within the catchment of Wolverly CE High School and would positively impact the schools long term viability.</p> <p>It would be capable of sustaining a bus service</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It would potentially be able to provide live-work units</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO689</a>	Site submitted - Land off Crundalls Lane/Hoarstone Lane	Comment	<p>Suggests new site: Land off Crundalls Lane / Hoarstone Lane Bewdley.</p> <p>It is understood that the adjoining land owner (Grey Green Farm) would potentially release the land to the west in addition to this site.</p> <p>Two blocks of land with road frontage totalling 10.52ha. Hoarstone Lane is narrow but there is sufficient land/space for infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Sustainable site, well located to existing residential, cycle and road networks, bus routes, shops and other services.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO691</a>	Site submitted - Orchard House, Far Forest	Comment	Call for Sites Submission form: Orchard House, Cleobury Road, Far Forest
	<a href="#">LPPO38</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Woolworths Building</li> <li>• Two Court buildings</li> <li>• Derelict and empty factories within the town area</li> <li>• Empty shops no longer fit for purpose</li> <li>• The Glades site</li> <li>• Empty shops in Blackwell Street</li> <li>• Crown House</li> <li>• The old factory in Park Lane</li> </ul> <p>These could all be knocked down and new housing built in the town.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO51</a>	Alternative site - Land at Aggborough	Comment	I believe that the Harriers are moving their ground to the practice grounds by Birchen Coppice, this will leave the ground by Aggborough for further development. This is a far better option as it is nearer the town centre and rail links etc.
	<a href="#">LPPO56</a>	Site submitted - Railway Corner, Stanklyn Lane, Kidderminster	Comment	Suggests site at Railway Corner, Stanklyn Lane, Kidderminster. Both in isolation and also in conjunction with the preferred option A. We would like to propose 3 bungalows on the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO61</a>	Strategy	Comment	<p>The question is whether you join the three towns of Kidderminster, Stourport and Bewdley together with the infrastructure already in place i.e. roads and other requirements well within reach. In the event you expand into the country side without the infrastructure it all costs more and once the country side has been built on its gone for good, whereas with a few exceptions little would be lost with the integration of the three towns.</p> <p>Take the request for building down Dry Mill Lane Bark Hill that could be built at the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>top of Blackstone bank where water pipes are presently being laid. This in my opinion is far more acceptable to the community than the present request with all additional facilities required along with increased traffic problems for Welch Gate and Bewdley.</p> <p>Whilst high rise flats are not the in thing at present it is more than likely we will in the future due to the continued expansion of the human race we will build upward.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO115</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>Would like to see a major expansion or the building on the Lea Castle site taking Green Belt right up to the A499 and across the Park Gate Rd in the field opposite. This would take less Green Belt and can use existing infrastructure. Potentially 2500 houses could be built</p> <p>I propose that a larger development is built on Lea Castle, taking in adjoining farm land. This will allow links with Wolverhampton Rd and Stourbridge Rd.</p> <p>A sizable development, say 2000 + houses, would be able to have a school , shops and maybe a bus route. This would prevent straining on existing services and also would feed into Wolverley High School, which is under subscribed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO191</a>	Alternative sites - Wyre Forest Golf Course	Comment	<p>The land at Burlish, until recently a golf course, is also available and in my understanding already belongs to the local authority. In view of it being extremely unlikely to be taken over for use as another golf course as there is overcapacity in other clubs within an easy access to the district. This is very poor land for agricultural use, having a reputation of only able to grow stones. So no great loss to national food production. This land has not been cultivated since before the last war. However, the council record is not good in this respect, taking over fields used for recreation, to build new council offices. So much for the national obesity crisis. The plans only seem to identify only a small portion of this land as core. The</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				whole of the old golf course, not Green Belt land, should be fully utilised before considering other options.
	<a href="#">LPPO195</a>	Alternative sites - Land Between Kidderminster and Wolverley B4190	Comment	<p>Option C?</p> <p>Land (No mans land) between Kidderminster and Wolverley B4190 maybe an option, perhaps further enquiries could be made into this.</p> <p>We appreciate difficult decisions have to be made especially in the light of the government guidelines, but surely it makes more sense to use less Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO196</a>	Alternatives Selba Drive HELAA BHS/22	Object	I wish to object to the inclusion of “Land off Selba Drive, Kidderminster (referred to as BHS/22 - HELAA Reference Number) in the Local Plan Review. This land is a public amenity, the only open land used by very many living on the Habberley estate for a variety of purposes including dog exercise, children playing, family sitting/picnic area, various ball games (where every other small amount of sward is labelled “No Ball Games”). All other land surrounding this area is privately owned and not open to public access.
CORE11	<a href="#">LPPO243</a>	6-57	Comment	The retired eastern by pass plan should be re-visited. Links to this route from new developments near Kidderminster would be feasible, and at the same time combine with tourism from the north, and relieve traffic into Kidderminster, plus combining with the already completed Bewdley by pass. A western by pass should also be pursued for the same reasons. If planned correctly much of any new road building could be done independently of new housing and or commercial operations.
	<a href="#">LPPO269</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>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="#">LPPO315</a>	Site submitted - Land at Northwood Lane, Bewdley	Comment	<p>My client is disappointed that the site WA/BE/4 (land at Northwood Lane, Bewdley) has not been zoned for residential development. The land is not in the Green Belt and development would improve the landscape by removing existing structures. The site is within walking distance of facilities in Wribbenhall and Bewdley town centre. It is a sustainable location. Any increase in traffic would be very marginal. The site is perfect for low density “self-build” housing (3 or 4</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				developments) within an overall Master Plan layout. My client asks that the site be zoned for this use.
Cory & Morgan	<a href="#">LPPO316</a>	Site submitted - Land at Wilden Top, Stourport	Comment	My clients are disappointed that their site (MI/20- Land at Wilden Top) has not been zoned for housing. Wilden village has all the facilities to make it a “sustainable” location. If MI/20 was developed with MI/17 and MI/21, this would give a better outcome than sites west of the River Severn in Stourport (Option B housing site) as there would be less pressure on urban roads in Stourport and easier access to Kidderminster, Worcester and Birmingham.
	<a href="#">LPPO317</a>	Site submitted - Land at Wilden Lane, Stourport	Comment	My clients own land on Wilden Lane. It is currently used for storage and business purposes. My clients and their children are Gypsies with a long history of residence in the Stourport area. My clients wish to create a 4 pitch private Gypsy site on their land. This would help meet the identified shortfall of 21 pitches between 2020 and 2034. My clients ask that their land be allocated in the local plan, shown on the proposals map and be removed from the Green Belt. If this request is met in the Deposit version of the plan (Feb 2018) my clients will move towards detailed designs and a planning application.
Trustees G W Hardwick	<a href="#">LPPO322</a>	Site submitted - Land off Lowe Lane, Fairfield	Comment	There is no new land allocation for housing in Wolverley or Cookley during the plan period. Whilst it is acknowledged that affordable housing sites have been developed recently, it is not “robust” to not allocate any land for the 17 years to 2034. This is especially so as both communities have significant base populations and the density of built form is unlikely to lead to a meaningful number of windfall sites, even if the ‘garden land’ restriction is eased. Given that Housing Needs Surveys are to be conducted in 2017/18 for the area it would be prudent to zone the ADR’s for phased release for housing, including my client’s land in WFR/WC/22.
	<a href="#">LPPO323</a>	Site submitted - Corner of Caunsall Road / Kinver	Comment	There is no allocation of land for new housing in Cookley up to 2034. This is not ‘robust’ as required by Local Plan guidance. A local Housing Needs Survey will be

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
		Lane, Cookley		completed in 2017/18 and is likely to show unmet local demand for the plan period. My client’s site on the corner of Caunsall Road and Kinver Lane is PDL benefitting from approvals 15/1069/FULL and 15/2056/CR. The attached drawing 3466-04A dated 6/6/17 shows that the requirements of the approvals can be met, in addition to 3 extra dwellings. This is an applicable ‘windfall’ site and should be removed from the Green Belt and zoned for housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO343</a>	Alternative site suggestion	Object	<p><b>Response to Local Plan Review Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report (May and June 2017) in respect of the proposed non-allocation of site WFR/WC/10 - Land off Kimberlee Ave, Cookley</b></p> <p>The 2017 Objective Assessment of Housing Need Report has evidenced the overall requirement for 300 new dwellings per annum over the new plan period, which would total 5,400 over the plan period. Sites in and around Cookley have access to many services including Shops, Schools and a Doctor’s surgery, good access to open space or sports facilities and therefore score highly for sustainability objectives. The Draft Plan identifies as a key principle that villages in the Rural East of the District are more sustainable than in the Rural West as they have more service provision and public transport</p> <p>As explained in the Development Strategy there is now a need to remove land from the Green Belt for both housing and employment development to support essential elements of the strategy. Under proposed Local Plan Review Preferred Options, three large sites near Cookley are proposed to be allocated. These sites are; WFR/WC/15 - Lea Castle Hospital, BW/4 - Hurcott ADR and WFR/CB/7, OC/4/5/6/12/13N, WFR/ST/1, FPH/27 - East of Kidderminster (N), all of which will require changes to the Green Belt boundary. Predicted benefits for these site options stem from the implementation of a Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road and the provision of sufficient, appropriately located education facilities but a question remains over whether these benefits will ever outweigh the disadvantage caused</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>by the large-scale of expansion to the east of Kidderminster.</p> <p>In the Preferred Options document which addresses the approach to the location of future homes, it is recognised the provision of small scale residential development, to meet specific local needs within the District’s rural settlements will be encouraged. In order to help the Council address the shortfall in dwellings, an additional option for the future development of such a site in this category; WFR/WC/10 - Land off Kimberlee Ave, Cookley should be considered.</p> <p>The proposed sites; WFR/WC/15 - Lea Castle Hospital, BW/4 - Hurcott ADR and WFR/CB/7, OC/4/5/6/12/13N, WFR/ST/1, FPH/27 - East of Kidderminster (N) do not adjoin the village of Cookley or Kidderminster itself. However, the site; WFR/WC/10 - Land off Kimberlee Ave, Cookley is better related to the existing village facilities at the village core than the proposed sites submitted Preferred Options document.</p> <p>The reasons given by the Council for not allocating the site at WFR/WC/10 - Land off Kimberlee Ave, Cookley are not made clear in the Preferred Options document. Parts of the Strategic Green Belt Study (AMEC 2016) and a more detailed Second Stage Green Belt Study (AMEC 2017) which forms part of the evidence base seem contradictory, in that on the one hand the Green Belt is fulfilling its intended strategic purpose but on the other, sites for some 2500 dwellings are to be allocated from within the Green Belt.</p> <p><b>Deliverability</b></p> <p>Following the initial feasibility studies and during the early stages of the emerging Local Plan, the site; WFR/WC/10 - Land off Kimberlee Ave, Cookley was advised to the Council to be considered for suitability of development. Should this site come forward, it is available for immediate development and would be deliverable for</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>housing to meet local needs in appropriate circumstances.</p> <p>Potential access into the site; WFR/WC/10 - Land off Kimberlee Ave, Cookley from either of three corners (NW, SW or SE) could allow a varied range of site design but the most likely would involve a standard cul-de-sac streetscape of at least 35 dwellings. The site is well located in terms of the road network and any road safety impact could be mitigated by accessing it over an existing service road, currently maintained by a statutory undertaker. The unacceptable impact of the nearby A449 Trunk Road for future occupiers would be mitigated by surrounding agricultural land and with development not possible where the Elan Valley Aqueduct runs adjacent the site boundary, a buffer would be created for some of the present houses. Existing hedgerow areas on the western and southern site boundaries could be retained and enhanced to screen the development from existing houses on Kimberlee Avenue and Brampton Close.</p> <p><b>Relationship with existing services</b></p> <p>The site; WFR/WC/10 - Land off Kimberlee Ave, Cookley is very well located in the village in relation to existing services, with a good range of services within a significantly lower walking distance than the proposed allocated sites; WFR/WC/15 - Lea Castle Hospital, BW/4 - Hurcott ADR and WFR/CB/7, OC/4/5/6/12/13N, WFR/ST/1, FPH/27 - East of Kidderminster (N). A Public Footpath passes along the western and southern boundaries of the site providing possibilities to link into this footpath network directly from the site itself. The footpath leads to the canal tow path and the local recreational area with various sports facilities including Cookley Sports &amp; Social Club and play equipment. Adjoining the recreational area are two Primary Schools. These facilities can equally be easily accessed via Castle Road where again a choice of access exits via a Public Footpath linking to Lea Lane or the local roads themselves.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Within 600-700 metres of the site; WFR/WC/10 - Land off Kimberlee Ave, Cookley, the village offers a Doctors surgery, Village Hall, two Public Houses, Post Office, Church, Restaurants, Shops and Supermarket. The proposed sites; WFR/WC/15 - Lea Castle Hospital, BW/4 - Hurcott ADR and WFR/CB/7, OC/4/5/6/12/13N, WFR/ST/1, FPH/27 - East of Kidderminster (N) would involve walking approximately a mile from the closest point of the sites, which may, in reality, not be the access points available once a site layout has been drawn.</p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>It is considered the proposed site; WFR/WC/10 - Land off Kimberlee Ave, Cookley is ideally placed to provide family housing due to its excellent access to a full range of local facilities, including local school provision and medical services and access to the Church.</p> <p>Adequate vehicular access could be provided to the site. The site also offers an opportunity to join onto the existing excellent public footpath network in Cookley village, with links via pathways and cycle paths to employment, education and retail areas. All dwellings would be within 400m of a bus stop reducing need to travel by car, thus promoting energy efficiency.</p> <p>As a small scale residential development, there will be no requirement to provide additional roads which would have a cumulative adverse effect on the Green Belt and increase flood risk to the district.</p> <p>The site has historically been used as agricultural land and is currently an unused grazing paddock. Further fieldwork for archaeological potential is likely to be necessary but this is no different to the majority of land in the Wyre Forest area. There are no significant trees on the site and there are no Tree Protection Orders in force. There are no international conservation designations on or adjacent to</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>the site and there is potential for biodiversity enhancement and improved green/blue links.</p> <p>The site is both available for development and deliverable and is considered to be better related to village services than other sites proposed to be allocated. It is requested that this site is taken forward as an allocation within the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review Preferred Options (June 2017).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO404</a>	6.57	Comment	See summary LPPO400.
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO549</a>	Site submitted - Land at Pound Bank, Far Forest	Comment	Our Clients' land is adjacent to Far Forest, outside Green Belt and should be supported as promoted for at least 50% affordable homes and/or Starter Homes.
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO554</a>	Alternatives	Support	<p>Planning Reasons</p> <p>1. Change of Policy increasing provision of Affordable Homes from 30% to 40% would help address shortage of affordable homes in schemes of over 10 dwellings and over 1000 gross square metres. Larger developers would see this affecting viability and profits, and would resist. At the same time this would reduce the amount of normal housing being provided so more land would need to be provided.</p> <p>2. If rural settlements outside Green Belt were allowed to expand where landowners were prepared to provide at least 50% affordable homes/starter homes this would provide for a considerable amount of the shortfall. It would take the burden away in the foreseeable future of massive infrastructure costs for a new relief road.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>POLITICALLY</p> <p>3. It would reduce the amount of protests recently about the use of Green Belt land for housing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO462</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	<p>Why cannot the lea castle site as a whole be developed between the A449 and Stourbridge road to the east this would give good infrastructure in the form of transport links and as this is already a major site will have the drainage , site is not within the east and south site flood plains. This could be developed to be self sufficient as there would be enough houses built to justify a new primary school and have local amenities constructed .If the land to the east and west of the current proposals were also developed this would allow a sustainable bus route, have access to the local secondary school in Wolverley and provide a sustainable community.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO510</a>	Alternative site suggestions	Comment	<p>Extend the site to the Wolverhampton Road and at the rear of Lea Castle site up to Axborough lane. Link up to Sion Hill to link with the Sion Hill Middle school site.</p> <p>With the additional land proposed including sites in that area already identified by WFDC including Hurcott ADR a sustainable community of around 2000 to 2500 homes could be created.</p> <p>This would be large enough to support a 2 form entry primary school.</p> <p>It would support a village centre which is within the Cookley parish but would not become a burden on that community.</p> <p>It could sustain a bus service.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>it could produce live work units</p> <p>it would be with in the catchment of Wolverley CE High School catchment and so help with the long term viability of the school.</p> <p>A linear development to the east of Kidderminster would not be a sustainable community. It would not have a 'heart' and could not accommodate a neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>Offmore Primary school is full.</p> <p>Land to the rear of Offmore and Baldwin Road is higher and development would be visible.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO692</a>	Site submitted - The Oxleys, Tenbury Road	Comment	Call for sites submission: The Oxleys, Tenbury Road, Clows Top.
	<a href="#">LPPO697</a>	Site submitted - Adjacent to Stone Hill North, Kidderminster (OC/13)	Comment	<p>Suggests additional site adjacent to Stone Hill North (OC/13).The land extends to approximately 19.5ha.</p> <p>The area is considered an essential addition to Stone Hill North (OC/13) and provided natural infill. The land would offer additional land area, is level and naturally screened in part.</p>
Hingley & Callow	<a href="#">LPPO699</a>	Site submitted - Land off Bromsgrove Road, Kidderminster	Comment	<p>Suggests new site off Bromsgrove Road, adjacent to Stone Hill North (OC/13).</p> <p>The land extends to approximately 5.98ha adjoining red shaded core housing site listed as Stone Hill North. This land parcel gives a natural fill of the proposed Stone Hill North / Stone Hill South housing sites as identified and will provide for alternative access arrangements and infrastructure provisions as may be required by the overall scheme. Incorporation will also provide scope for protection for the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				water course and similar. Topography is well suited and location essential for "gateway development".
Hingley & Callow Oils Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO701</a>	Site submitted - Station Yard, Blakedown	Comment	Suggests new site at Station Yard, Blakedown.
	<a href="#">LPPO703</a>	Site submitted - Fold Farm, Chaddesley	Comment	<p>Suggests new site, Fold Farm, Chaddesley</p> <p>We would like to add land, as shown edged red on the attached plan, extending to approximately 0.30ha located at Fold Farm Chaddesley Corbett.</p> <p>The site is suggested as suitable for low density housing with a sympathetic design scheme to enhance surrounding properties. The site is also considered an ideal location for accommodation for retired persons.</p>
Inshore Support Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO707</a>	Site submitted - Hurcott Lane/Hurcott Kennels/Stourbridge Rd, Kidderminster	Comment	<p>The land, which extends to approx. 10.74 acres, is located to the south of the Stourbridge Road, east of Hurcott Lane and north of the property known as Hurcott Kennels (which is also owned by our client). The land is more particularly shown edged in red on the attached plan.</p> <p>To the west of our clients site is land which is currently subject to an outline planning application (ref: 16/0003/OUTL) for a residential development of up to 100 dwellings known as 'Land South of Stourbridge Road Kidderminster'.</p> <p>It is our view that our client's site would be a sustainable option for the delivery of further housing for Kidderminster in line with the potential delivery of housing both at the Miller site and on Lea Castle Hospital (part of which is also subject to an application for up to 600 dwellings, up to 3,350 sq m of Class B1 employment uses and 150 sq m of Class A1/A3/D1 uses under ref 17/0205/OUTL).</p> <p>Focusing some of Kidderminster's housing delivery along the Stourbridge Road</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>would, in our view, be more sustainable in terms of releasing land from the Green Belt than allowing the delivery of other sites which have a greater impact on areas of ecological and conservation interest such as those proposed further south along Hurcott Lane and around Hurcott village.</p> <p>Our clients are dedicated to trying to protect the cherished Hurcott Park which provides an important green 'lung' in towards the built up area of north east Kidderminster and, as such, feel strongly that development should be kept in close proximity to key arterial routes into the centre and away from key 'green' amenities which are so strongly valued by local residents.</p> <p>We trust that our clients site will be looked upon favourably and that it will be considered as a sustainable future release from the Green Belt for the delivery of housing</p>
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPPO722</a>	Site submitted - Hayes Road, Wolverley	Comment	Call for sites form submitted - Hayes Road, Wolverley.
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPPO731</a>	Site submitted - Land off Selba Drive	Comment	Call for sites form submitted - Land off Selba Drive
	<a href="#">LPPO736</a>	Site submitted - Land at Causall	Comment	<p>Call for sites form submitted - Land at Causall.</p> <p>It is infilling development across the site road frontage and therefore accords with NPPF para.89.</p>
Horton Estates Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO825</a>	Site submitted - Cursley Distribution Park, Curslow Lane	Comment	New site submitted - Cursley Distribution Park, which has not been promoted during previous rounds of consultation on the LPR. Request that Cursley Distribution Park be designated as a previously-developed site in the Green Belt

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>under draft Policy 34, to provide a development plan policy framework which explicitly supports the principle of replacement buildings, limited infilling and partial/complete redevelopment of this site, in accordance with paragraph 89 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In addition, through a rationalisation of the substantial brownfield site it would be possible to release land from the Green Belt and allocate it for residential use to contribute towards your District’s identified housing needs (housing need has already been identified as an “<i>exceptional circumstance</i>” to justify the release of Green Belt land throughout the District, in the context of NPPF para. 83). In addition we request that the site be considered through your Authority’s Brownfield Land Register assessment process.</p> <p>Cursley Distribution Park extends to c.10ha of previously-developed land located c.3km southeast of Kidderminster and 4km east of Stourport-on-Severn, close to the border with Wychavon District Council. Hartlebury Railway Station and Hartlebury Trading Estate lie c.3km to the south-west. The site is accessed from Curslow Lane; with the site’s single point of access taken 400m north of the Droitwich Road crossroads (A422). The village of Shenstone lies c.800m to the north-west.</p> <p>The site provides a significant quantum of floorspace (22,557 sq m) currently used for industrial purposes (B2 and B8 Use Classes, with ancillary administrative/office accommodation). The site boundary and buildings are identified on the Existing Site Plan. The floorspace is provided principally in the form of four significant high-bay warehouses (each ranging between 3,800 and 5,320 sq m), although there are ten other smaller buildings (including offices and housing for plant and machinery). There is an extensive internal road network and areas of external hardstanding (used as service/loading yards) within the site linking the various buildings. The buildings and roads/hardstanding are separated by areas of managed grassland, although there are only a small number of trees within the site and on the boundaries (the site is secured by a fence beyond existing hedgerows on the boundaries). It is understood that the site was originally</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>developed as a Ministry of Defence (MOD) storage depot (it appears that some of the building may have been aircraft hangars with blast walls) but it has been used for civilian employment purposes since at least 2005. The owners have invested in the asset to provide commercial units which can be let on flexible and competitive terms. However, some of the buildings are very old and there will be a need for redevelopment in the short-medium term to ensure that the buildings offer attractive facilities for the market. Save for the Green Belt designation, there are no significant environmental/physical constraints to development within or adjoining the site; there are no heritage assets (scheduled monuments, listed buildings or conservation areas); no nature conservation designations; and the site lies entirely within the Environment Agency’s Flood Zone 1. This is supported by the site assessment within the Employment Land Review (June 2016, Site Ref. 10). To the north are two bungalows and to the south are two dwellings. To the east and west lies agricultural land (arable).</p> <p><b>Potential Site Development</b></p> <p>The owners are considering options to redevelop and modernise the site including the limited infilling of vacant land in-between existing buildings and/or the redevelopment/replacement of existing buildings. This would provide a more efficient and modern business environment, and would be an entirely acceptable form of development in principle given the fourth and sixth bullet points of NPPF para. 89 which state that the replacement of an existing building and the limited infilling or partial/complete redevelopment of previously-developed sites in the Green Belt is not “<i>inappropriate</i>” development (in the case of the latter two types of development the national policy requirement is that they must “<i>...not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the purpose of including land within it than the existing development</i>”). These representations request that this national policy be made explicit in the LPR by designating Cursley Distribution Park under Policy 34 as previously-developed land (PDL) within the Green Belt (akin to the designation of the nearby Rushock Trading Estate). Representatives of the owners met with Development Control in May 2017 to discuss the emerging</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>proposals and it is understood they received positive feedback in relation to the potential for site rationalisation where this would comply with NPPF para. 89. I also understand that there was acknowledgement that a rationalisation of the site could potentially release areas of PDL which could be redeveloped for small-scale residential purposes, as part of a comprehensive mixed-use development whereby existing employment floorspace/use is retained. I am informed by my Client that your Authority assesses the <i>“impact on openness of Green Belt”</i> on the basis of existing building volume.</p> <p>The attached Illustrative Masterplan has been prepared to provide a broad indication of how the site could be comprehensively and efficiently rationalised to replace several of the existing older buildings with modern employment buildings resulting in a total building floorspace (c.21,363 sqm) and volume (c.223,435 m3) which is a reduction on the existing position (c.22,557sqm / c.231,293 m3). In addition, this form of development would enable the potential release of areas of brownfield land which could be redeveloped for residential use. It should be noted that the Masterplan indicates a level of residential development which will exceed the existing level of building floorspace and volume (this will need to be calculated in detail) but it does serve as an indication of how the site could be developed more efficiently, and where surplus land could be released to the north and/or south. In terms of the residential development, small housing sites (1.5ha <i>“Upper Residential”</i> and 1.9ha <i>“Lower Residential”</i>) could be provided with their own designated points of access from Curslow Road, each capable of accommodating circa 40 dwellings (representing a low density to reflect the site’s rural context). The attached Masterplan is purely indicative and we would welcome the opportunity to discuss the proposals with Officers of your Authority in further detail. However, we contend that the site can offer <i>“suitable”, “available”</i> and <i>“achievable”</i> brownfield land for residential development in the context of NPPF para. 47. It is, therefore, <i>“deliverable”</i> and can be considered for release from the Green Belt.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
Hurcott Village Management Committee	<a href="#">LPPO1629</a>	Alternative suggestion - Extended Lea Castle	Comment	<p>I would like to make the following observations in favour of the development of the Lea Castle Site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Options A and B of the WFDC current draft proposes using <u>some</u> of Lea Castle land for development. If the whole of the Lea Castle site were included in this proposed development then a new sustainable village, like Cookley, could be created.</li> <li>• With a sustainable community of say 1500+ homes this could become a new Village with shops and a two form entry Primary School.</li> <li>• It could support a village centre which, despite being in the parish of Cookley, would be a separate village.</li> <li>• It would have good existing road links to Kidderminster, Stourbridge, Bridgnorth, Wolverhampton and beyond.</li> <li>• It would be capable of sustaining a bus service.</li> <li>• It would be within the catchment of Wolverley CE High School which would have a positive impact on the school's long term viability.</li> </ul>
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1432</a>	Additional site - Wolverhampton Road	Comment	<p>Gladman are promoting land straddling the Wolverhampton Road adjacent to the urban edge of Kidderminster to the south of the B4189. (HELAA ref. WFR/WC/16) 17Ha site capable of delivering up to 400 dwellings. Could bring it forward within 5 years of land being removed from Green Belt through Local Plan process.</p> <p>Eastern section already proposed under option A. Proposed release of western parcel as is also well contained and its release would help to establish recognisable urban edge to use as new GB boundary.</p>
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1433</a>	Additional site The Lakes Road Bewdley	Support	<p>Gladman are promoting land at The Lakes Road Bewdley for housing. 9.52Ha site located within 2km of town centre. HELAA concluded that only 3Ha was deliverable. This reflects several factors which Gladman believe can be mitigated</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				for. Outline application for 195 dwellings now going to appeal (16/0550/OUTL). In accordance with NPPF, site is deliverable, available and offers suitable location for development now. It would help to significantly boost housing supply in location outside of Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO2713</a>	Alternative Options	Comment	<p><u>Other options for Building, Blue Sky Thinking</u></p> <p>a. Park Lane - numerous redundant industrial buildings which have no historical merit and a timber yard which should be relocated to an industrial estate. The site opens on to the canal and would be a prime housing development. Whilst it would actually be good if Park Lane were dualled to complete the ring road, I assume that this is unlikely.</p> <p>b. Glades Leisure Centre. This land already belongs to WFDC. The councillors have a vanity project to build a Multiplex cinema and extra restaurants etc which will further denude the town of retail facilities. It is immoral for Wyre Forest District Council to be building a Multiplex whilst ignoring the need for low cost housing. In reality no developer will invest in building a Multiplex cinema in Kidderminster as there is no financial justification and so this land will remain empty when it would be an ideal site for low cost housing within walking distance of the town. Any local council which wanted to protect its town centre would reject the idea of building outside it and would build much needed low cost houses on land which it already owns.</p> <p>c. The whole of the east side of Bromsgrove Street could be redeveloped into a mixture of low rise flats and small houses for people who cannot afford cars or public transport but who could then access the town centre.</p> <p>d. Worcester Street is a totally dead street. If there really is a market for a Multiplex cinema then it should be built on the site of the large retail units</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>(formerly Woolworths, Littlewoods), opening directly into the town and a bowling alley in the same complex. Current tenants could move into the former TJ Hughes shop bringing another part of the town back to life. The other developments envisaged for the Glades site could also be built in Worcester Street saving this part of town from total devastation. The rest of Worcester Street should be released from retail usage for housing because realistically the town is not going to require these retail units. Even if Worcester Street is kept as retail there is considerable scope to create housing above the retail units. WFDC seems to reject ideas of this nature because they are too difficult. The Council should ask as an facilitator and not take no for an answer. The council has greater powers for Compulsory Purchase than it seems to realise. It is ,however, far easier to build on green field sites and continue to allow the town to die.</p> <p>e. In the unlikely event of a Multiplex ever getting built on Worcester Street I envisage that a roof could be built over enclosing the current square outside the Littlewoods building. Above the Multiplex would be the ideal place to build flats for independent senior citizens. Independent people who no longer have cars are far happier having independent access to shops and other leisure facilities rather than having to rely on others for lifts. Building here would give direct access to Bromsgrove Street but also by lift to the Multiplex and to Worcester Street to access all the towns facilities.</p> <p>There is however an alternative for Worcester Street:</p> <p>f. Worcester Street could be re-designated on the east side as the Kidderminster Craft Quarter and on the west side as the Kidderminster Antiques Quarter. Instead of reopening the street to traffic, replace the street lighting with Victorian style gas lamps(LED really). Reface the shops to look like a high class Victorian Shopping Street. This obviously costs money and I am aware that the empty buildings do not belong to the council. However, it would surely be better to spend money on</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>upgrading the shops and ensuring that the upper floors were occupied as housing rather than wasting money creating a rat run. I do wonder whether because this would be a craft centre, that funding could be sought from the Arts Council or the Lottery Community fund. The east side properties would then be let to a mixture of jewellers, glass makers, potters, weavers, artisan bakers etc who would manufacture and sell from the premises. They might well do a large proportion of their business on the net enabling the properties not to be rated as retail. The antiques quarter could be similarly developed. Indeed if Bromsgrove Street East is redeveloped for housing the existing antiques shops could be relocated onto Worcester Street where they would get higher footfall and kick start the process. The major advantage of redeveloping Worcester Street in this way is that if done properly it would become a nationally acknowledged tourist attraction and bring the thousands of visitors to the Safari Park and SVR into the town. Whilst this is not directly associated with the plan, it would be possible immediately to start a monthly craft and antiques market on Worcester Street to establish the direction of travel.</p> <p>g. Green Street/ Meadow Mill Industrial Estate. Green Street has a derelict Industrial Unit, formerly the Frank Stone building. This has no architectural merit and should be demolished. New build on Green Street could be architectural structured to match heritage buildings. Behind this unit is the Meadow Mill Estate. The largest part of this estate is empty space, used by the tenants as car parking but there is a surplus of space. There are tributaries of the Stour crossing this land which automatically makes it attractive for housing. I see a massive opportunity to create better quality industrial units and housing on the site giving a much better usage and more attractive site. To do this it would be necessary to build two sets of roads. Imagine these as interlocking fingers of two hands. Entering down the fingers of one hand would give access to the ground floor industrial units. Entering down the fingers of the other hand would give access to the low rise housing units. This would provide total separation of the domestic and commercial traffic and</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>improve both the look and the usage of the site several times over. Whilst once again our council would dismiss this plan out of hand because it is too difficult, I envisage that the owners of the site would make a considerable profit from this scheme whilst increasing the number of small commercial units available and creating hundreds of residential units.</p> <p>h. Completely redesign the high school provision for Kidderminster. Start with Baxter College. This is a failed school that is losing students to the point that some of the current buildings are now being left empty. It shares its site with The Wyre Forest School which is a brand new building but was built for the wrong number of students and so is inadequate. A new, larger, school is required (including provision for 18-25 years olds). The solution to this is to close Baxter College completely and disperse its students between Wolverley and King Charles School. The Wyre Forest School should be rebuilt on the Sladen site. This fulfils the covenant for educational use and allows a school of the correct size to be built. The present King Charles 1 High School should be closed and an enlarged school be built on the site already earmarked behind the redundant Stourminster School. As an academy, KC1 school would find this attractive as it would profit from the sale and create a larger (and better financed) school. The final piece of the jigsaw would be to close Wolverley C of E High School and move it on to the vacated Baxter site. The brand new Wyre Forest School buildings will make an excellent sixth form centre. Two sites would be released for building. The KC1 site would give fantastic opportunities to build mixed housing within walking distance of the town and the station. The Wolverley site is enormous and would create a brand new village big enough to fill the gap between the brownfield availability and the 6000 units which WFDC has calculated that it needs. (not withstanding the fact that the 6000 units aren't required. At least if they were built on the West side they would be within commuting distance of Wolverhampton/ Bridgnorth,etc.)</p> <p>I. There is considerable scope to redevelop the land around the Harriers football</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>ground. The industrial estate is another example of grossly underutilised industrial land. This combines with the enormous problem of a lack of parking for the new Kidderminster station and the SVR. The solution is to dig the entire site out and create a two-storey underground carpark. On top of this at the level of the current Hoo Road would be the industrial units and above these would be low rise residential units. For a blueprint of how this could be achieved, look at the Victoria Centre in Nottingham (I am aware that the hole already existed). Again, because of the ability to charge for parking and the housing this would be a profitable and therefore viable project. This development could actually be a prestige project which would attract national attention for its brilliant use of space. I also envisage a profitable project in building a new East Stand at the Harriers ground. (Again to look for a blue print look at the current Chelsea Football ground). A new stand would incorporate seating for the football club, new changing facilities (Harriers Ladies team?) and flats. The great thing about the flats is that they would face the SVR. This could be a very profitable development as it would be ideal for high value flats with access to the station.</p> <p>Many of my suggestions will be rejected by Wyre Forest District Council, but I believe that they are all commercially viable. They could contribute to the positive development of Kidderminster unlike building on the greenfield land, or missing out on town centre development and allowing the town to continue its slide to dereliction.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2807</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>In Kidderminster, brownfield sites should be used. There are available empty properties owned by Wyre Forest District Council, which should be developed into affordable housing. Worcester street in Kidderminster is a street of empty shops with accommodation above. Why is this not being looked at before taking Green Belt land?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2797</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>Before building on this valuable Green Belt/farm land all the land at and around the old Lea Castle site should be used together with all brownfield sites no matter</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				how small and which are in an accessible position of which there are many around Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO2515</a>	Site Suggestion - extended Lea Castle	Comment	Suggests a larger site at Lea Castle. Utilising all of the land proposed in both Option A and B and extending the site to include land up to the Wolverhampton Road and at the rear of Lea Castle up to Axborough Lane. There might also be a possibility of further development on the eastern side of Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill, which would link with development at the Sion Hill School site. With this proposed land, including the sites in that vicinity already included in the Plan, a sustainable community of around 2,000-2,500 houses could be created. This would be large enough to support a 2 form entry primary school within the catchment of Wolverley High School (thus positively impacting on the schools long term viability) and a sustainable bus service. It would also support a 'village' centre within the Cookley Parish without putting a burden on that community and would potentially be able to support live-work units,
	<a href="#">LPPO3033</a>	6.57	Object	Question 4: further options? Not without further information other than to say that brownfield land should be used first
	<a href="#">LPPO737</a>	Site submitted - Fingerpost Cottage, Cleobury Road, Rock	Comment	Call for sites form submitted - Fingerpost Cottage, Cleobury Road, Rock.
	<a href="#">LPPO2297</a>	Options	Comment	Question the need for the amount of housing needed. Does not consider the release of housing from the older population as on Spennels. Affordable housing would be better placed nearer the town centre / or within reasonable walking distance of the railway station. Convert the "Courthouse", use the land where the auction / markets are presently. Make changes to the more derelict areas around the town – old carpet mills – horsefair - etc
	<a href="#">LPPO2877</a>	Alternatives	Comment	It states there is insufficient brownfield sites and non- Green Belt land to

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>accommodate housing and employment growth.</p> <p>There are brownfield sites not even on the plan.</p> <p>Chuchfields Kidderminster , Brown Westhead Wolverley , park Lane , Kidderminster , Brown Westhead Wolverley. Kidderminster is a dead town and building affordable homes and bringing life and community back into the town should be a priority.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO515</a></p>	<p>Extended Lea Castle</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>I support building on the Lea Castle site for the following reasons:</p> <p>Large number of the dwellings would be on existing brownfield 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.</p> <p>A large number of dwellings could support a 2 form entry primary school, thus reducing the impact on the local facilities.</p> <p>It would be within the catchment of Wolverly CE High School and would positively impact the schools long term viability.</p> <p>It would be capable of sustaining a bus service</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It would potentially be able to provide live-work units.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO577</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>I support building on Lea Castle for the following reasons:</p> <p>Large number of dwellings would be on existing brownfield ground, and not reducing the amount of Green Belt land around the town. The size of the area could be further increased by using the land up to Axborough Lane.</p> <p>A large number of dwellings could support a 2 form entry primary school, thus reducing the impact on the local facilities.</p> <p>It would be within the catchment of Wolverly CE High School and would positively impact the schools long term viability.</p> <p>It would be capable of sustaining a bus service</p> <p>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.</p> <p>It would potentially be able to provide live-work units.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO626</a>	Alternative site suggestion	Comment	<p>A potential way to help preserve more of the Green Belt would be to revive the plan to rebuild King Charles I School on the Borrington Road site. This could increase school places at secondary level to support the proposed new housing developments. The original plan had much of the expansion into the Green Belt consisting of playing fields, which most people would find less objectionable than housing and also help to maintain clear land between Stone and Kidderminster. Old school site on Comberton Road could then be released for housing. This would be much more suitable than a site on the edge of Kidderminster since it is closer to town and facilities such as GP practices. It would be within walking distance of the railway station and so remove the need for extra</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				car journeys and also be within walking distance of the town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO671</a>	Alternative site suggestions	Comment	<p>I suggest that any of the following sites away from existing developments would make suitable sites as an alternative to Option A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sion Hill school</li> <li>- Lea Castle</li> <li>- Land on A456 between Blakedown and Hagley</li> <li>- Land which is no longer used by Wyre Forest Golf Club</li> <li>- The old Brintons Golf Driving range on Stourport Road.</li> </ul>
J & H Evans	<a href="#">LPPO690</a>	Site submitted - Land fronting Rectory Lane, Rock	Comment	Call for sites submitted: Land fronting Rectory Lane, Rock
	<a href="#">LPPO693</a>	Site submitted - Land North West of Ferndale Crescent, Kidderminster	Comment	<p>The land proposal off Ferndale Crescent has sustainable access to a wide range of services from bus stops to shops and schools to recreational space/facilities and represents a sustainable form of development.</p> <p>The land is grade 3 agricultural. There is a footpath crossing the site that would be retained.</p> <p>The site has attracted interest from several developers and, if removed from the Green Belt, would be deliverable within 5 years.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO698</a>	Site submitted - Land at Crundalls Lane / Grey Green Lane, Bewdley	Comment	<p>Suggests land off Crundalls Lane / Grey Green Lane.</p> <p>A total area of 6.95ha that would provide natural infill within the existing road structure network. Whilst part of the site is recognised as having limited flood risk this could be utilised effectively as open space giving an estimated 5ha of developable land. With a density of 20-25 houses per hectare on the net</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				developable area and allowing for public open space. It is also considered that this would be considered an ideal location to include an element of accommodation for retired persons.
Hingley & Callow	<a href="#">LPPO700</a>	Site submitted - Land off Stanklyn Lane, Kidderminster	Comment	<p>Suggests new site - Land off Stanklyn Lane.</p> <p>The site, as shown edged red on the attached plan, extends to approximately 3.3ha adjacent to an existing blue shaded option A housing site. This area would offer additional land area, is superbly screened by existing natural features and give an alternative access back to Stanklyn Lane. The site is suggested as suitable for low density housing with a sympathetic design scheme to enhance surrounding properties.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO702</a>	Site submitted - Land adjacent to Chaddesley School	Comment	<p>New site suggested - Land adjacent to Chaddesley School.</p> <p>We would like to add land, as shown edged red on the attached plan, extending to approximately 2.4ha located adjacent to Chaddesley Corbett School.</p> <p>The site provides an ideal opportunity to enable modern housing development. It may be beneficial for the school to be incorporated within the village boundary.</p>
R & D Turner Charitable Trust	<a href="#">LPPO706</a>	Site submitted - Land south of Arley Lane, Goods Green, Upper Arley	Comment	<p>New site suggested - land south of Arley Lane Goods Green, Upper Arley.</p> <p>The land is open farm land and includes a range of underutilised partially redundant farm buildings. The site in all extends to approximately 4.20ha, a plan showing the area outlined in red is attached for your information.</p> <p>The area is located opposite a previously developed residential site and offers scope for missed density housing to include starter and retirement homes. The land owners attitude towards development is positive and they desire to maintain a thriving village economy with employment and tourism generation, support for</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>the school, sports/social grounds, and local businesses a key focus.</p> <p>Accessibility is good and we understand principal</p>
Rock Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1164</a>	Site suggestion - Bliss Gate Inn	Comment	<p>Would like a policy in the Local Plan to encourage the refurbishment of the Bliss Gate Inn to be converted into units of accommodation together with the use of the rear Car Park. The site has fallen into a poor state of repair and really does great harm to the gateway into the Bliss Gate Village.</p>
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1053</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	<p>We strongly recommend a blend of Options A and B, amended to remove the Settling Ponds, Wilden Lane core allocation, the proposed eastern relief road and the Option A allocations to the east of Kidderminster because of their significant ecological impacts and the limited evidence underpinning the need for the road.</p> <p>We believe that such an approach would deliver the required level of development whilst taking a positive step towards reducing the overall environmental impact of the Local Plan. Notwithstanding this helpful improvement there will still be significant implications for biodiversity and Green Infrastructure arising from a number of the allocations and additional work to confirm the acceptability of their inclusion will be needed prior to finalising the Plan.</p> <p>Once the final allocations are agreed it will be essential for the Local Plan to set out mechanisms for the effective delivery of biodiversity enhancement and GI. The policy framework included in this consultation offers a helpful starting point, particularly in Policies 11D and 14, but we consider that the Plan needs to go further. With that in mind we would recommend that sites sitting in well defined geographic clusters be pulled together to form cohesive groups so that major developments are delivered using the GI led approach championed by the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership. In short such an approach would suggest that groups of contiguous or closely associated sites be covered by</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>overarching Green Infrastructure Concept Plans designed to maximise the environmental benefits available at each location. This fits closely with the policy framework already set out in policy 14 and offers a mechanism by which master planning of the major developments proposed can be guided towards the most sustainable outcomes. We would be pleased to discuss this with the council if that would be helpful.</p> <p>For further information please see our comments under the relevant allocations policies and our response to paragraph 6.54.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2170</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	Can the required number of new houses be provided by using the land around Lea Castle between the Wolverhampton Road and the Stourbridge Road? There are major highways already established in this area with good links to other urban areas and any development would not butt up to existing dwellings but could be a stand alone ‘village community’ with access to Wolverly High School.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO983</a>	6.57	Comment	Grey Green Lane - Could potentially develop north on either side of Grey Green Lane but would hope that this was not required. At Low Habberley there is a viable urban extension. This would then mean the urban extensions east of Kidderminster would not be needed. Site is well contained plateau between Habberley Valley and tributary of Honey Brook. Not high grade agricultural land.
Sir Thomas White's Charity	<a href="#">LPPO899</a>	Site submitted - Land North West of Kidderminster	Comment	Our client owns the land to the north-west of Kidderminster, adjacent to Habberley Road (B4190) and covers an area of approximately 36 hectares. A site location plan is submitted with this representation. The site is adjacent to the urban edge of Kidderminster and approximately 3.5km to the north-west of the centre. The site is bound by hedges which forms the boundary of the site. To the north the site is bound by Sandy Lane, which creates an access point to the site. To the east the site is bound by residential dwellings from Coningsby Drive, Harvington Close and Carlton Close. To the south the site is bound by High Habberley House and dense trees and to the west the site is bound by agricultural

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>land. Low Habberley Road transects the site from east to west.</p> <p>The site is deliverable for residential development and is situated within a sustainable location, with suitable accessibility. The site is within close proximity of a wide variety of services and facilities. Including a food superstore and post office 400m to the south, Franche Community Primary School 600m to the south, and Baxter College 700m to the south. The site is not constrained and could deliver housing immediately, which is supported by the Council’s Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA), published in June 2016, through which the majority of the site forms part of a wider assessed area. The HELAA concludes that the site is potentially developable after five years, if the site were to be released from the Green Belt. Therefore the site has the potential to make a meaningful contribution to the housing requirements within Kidderminster and if necessary could be delivered in phases. The site location plan submitted with this representation shows the potential for a phased development depending on the Council’s requirements. If there is a smaller, short term need, a smaller element of the site could be brought forward, as ‘Phase 1’ for approximately 120 dwellings. This would assist the Council in achieving its ambitious target of delivering 300 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Of the five Green Belt tests, the site is only considered to conflict with the test of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. However, this is inevitable given the Borough’s housing needs and the fact the plan is not proposing a sufficient supply to meet its needs. Given these pressing needs the release of the site will not compromise the delivery of urban regeneration and the use of derelict and urban land. The Council has exhausted these sources of supply before releasing other sites from the Green Belt which are proposed for allocation.</p> <p>Development of the site would not result in unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. It represents a minimal extension to the north western edge of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Kidderminster and would include landscaping to provide sufficient defensible boundaries to reduce its impact on the open landscape beyond the site.</p> <p>It would not result in neighbouring towns merging, there would remain a minimum 200m buffer between the edge of Low Habberley and the edge of phase 2, and in any case any proposals for the site would be sensitively designed, with open space provided on this edge to increase the buffer further. In turn this buffer would also ensure any development preserves the setting and character of Low Habberley.</p> <p>The representations above set out why our client considers that additional land needs to be allocated by the plan, as well as further flexibility should be incorporated within the Council's housing supply, if the plan is to be found sound. We also outline the reasoning the land north-west of Kidderminster being a suitable location for sustainable development and that it is an appropriate location for residential development to meet this shortfall.</p>
Stone Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1160</a>	Additional Site - King Charles High School, Kidderminster	Comment	Suggests that King Charles High School on Chester Road, Kidderminster be re-developed for housing. Relocating the High School to the land adjoining the Lower School at Borrington Road.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1553</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	<p>Potential issues with delivering solely Option 'A' or 'B,' a combination of the Options is most appropriate. There is concern that whilst the identification of a further urban extension in Option A is logical, deliverability will be dependent on all the land between Comberton Road (A448) and Worcester Road (A449) being secured.</p> <p>There is concern that the Council has not set out a balanced overview of Options A and B in setting out their consultation questions in paragraphs 6.54 to 6.56. For example, paragraph 6.55 outlines the benefits of Option 'A' and paragraph 6.56</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				largely discusses the dis-benefits of Option 'B', which provides a bias view in favour of Option 'A.' Taylor Wimpey consider there to be benefits and dis-benefits of both options which will need to be carefully considered in light of responses to this current consultation and further evidence prepared.
	<a href="#">LPPO709</a>	Site submitted - Heath Lane, Shenstone	Comment	Call for sites form submitted for land at Heath Lane, Shenstone. Proposed use for Travelling Showpeople
	<a href="#">LPPO2173</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leas Castle is ideal.</li> <li>• Can provide school and shops.</li> <li>• Has good roads north and south but Hurcott Road is already impossible.</li> </ul>
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1424</a>		Comment	Stourport-on-Severn is a sustainable market town that can accommodate more growth than currently identified under this policy. Non-Green Belt sites in sustainable locations also need to be considered. Land at Astley Cross also presents a development opportunity.
	<a href="#">LPPO2888</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Viable alternatives - do not accept that proper consideration has been given to all of the brownfield sites. Still scope for brownfield development of apartments and flats e.g. Park Lane, Green Street, site of Crown House, sites of former schools, Jobcentre etc best way to provide much needed affordable housing.</p> <p>An aging population need suitable housing to downsize to, near town centres and shops are ideal for this. Before releasing Green Belt you should demonstrate that there are insufficient brownfield (or green field non-Green Belt) alternatives. I do not believe you have done this in the current plan.</p> <p>I would support a 'Spennells type' development on the Lea Castle site, expanding the current proposal. A full development on that site would support a primary school. Creating a 'second Spennells' on the Lea castle site would have less impact</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				on local residents as it could be self-sustaining providing shops and live/work units providing employment opportunities. Lea Castle site has better road access, between two A roads it already has the necessary road infrastructure as the Wolverhampton Road and Stourbridge Road are already linked. This means there would be no 'rat runs' created through residential streets.
	<a href="#">LPPO3050</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Shortfall of housing should be met by utilising Brownfield sites as was the case on the old Power Station site in Stourport and the sugar beet factory in Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO3051</a>	Alternatives	Comment	What about the building in the Bull Ring that is not being pulled down now that could be made into accommodation?
Midcounties Co-operative Society	<a href="#">LPPO820</a>	Site submitted - Land South of Wolverley Road, Kidderminster	Comment	<p>Suggests site: Land south of Wolverley Road, Kidderminster (site ref FHN/7)</p> <p>The owner is keen to see the land brought forward for development as soon as possible and there are no physical or legal constraints on doing so.</p> <p>The site is currently included in the Green Belt and the Local Plan Review Preferred Options maintains such a designation.</p> <p>These representations do not address in any detail the scale or nature of the need for new housing in Wyre Forest though the right to do so a later stages of the Local Plan Review process is reserved.</p> <p>The published evidence &amp; other material which informs the Preferred Options demonstrates that there is a clear need to allocate a substantial amount of additional land for new housing; and that this need cannot be met without releasing for development a significant amount of land that is currently within the Green Belt. The Council's positive approach to addressing this challenge — a strategic review of the Green Belt, the development of a coherent spatial strategy and careful site selection - is to be welcomed. However irrespective of the nature of the spatial strategy adopted by the Local Plan Review, the release of land south of Wolverley Road for residential development is wholly justifiable.</p> <p>The site</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is bounded on three sides by the existing urban area and its development would represent a natural rounding off of the built form</li> <li>• it is framed by existing physical features and so and clear &amp; defensible Green Belt boundaries can be defined in line with provisions of NPPF para 85</li> <li>• its development would integrate well with &amp; benefit adjoining development by facilitating &amp; improving access from it to nearby countryside &amp; recreation</li> </ul> <p>New housing on the site would contribute to meeting acknowledged needs, be wholly acceptable at the site specific level and would not, by virtue of its modest scale and comfortable relationship with the existing area, prejudice whatever spatial strategy is pursued by the Local Plan Review or the functions of the Green Belt. The Council is urged to give positive consideration to its allocation for residential development by the Local Plan Review.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2057</a>	Extended Lea Castle, Wolverley Road and Ferndale	Comment	<p>Extend the land at Lea Castle up to Wolverhampton Road and at the Rear of the site up to Axborough Lane. Also develop on the western side of the Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill to link with the development of the Sion Hill Middle School site. The sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• within the catchment of Wolverley CE High School and could positively impact on the schools long term viability.</li> <li>• would be capable of sustaining a bus service.</li> <li>• would be large enough to support a 2 form entry primary school.</li> <li>• would support a village centre and would not put a burden on the Cookley Parish community.</li> <li>• could provide a sustainable community of 2,000 to 2,500 homes.</li> </ul> <p>Also the WFDC are wrong to not propose ANY development on the North/West of Kidderminster, at least 100-200 homes could be developed at the rear of the existing Ferndale Estate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2707</a>	6.57 Extended Lea Castle	Support	We support the proposal for Lea Castle sustainable village which would allow for a

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				community development, complete with primary school and would be capable of sustaining a bus service.
	<a href="#">LPPO1974</a>	Other site suggestions.	Comment	<p>Development could be carried out on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the site of the old Leisure centre and adjoining car park that could integrate the disused shops in Worcester Street</li> <li>• empty factory units behind Matalan</li> <li>• the old builders yard in Park Lane</li> <li>• Wyre Forest Golf Club (site now disused)</li> <li>• Crown House</li> </ul> <p>Development of the old Lea Castle site should be used before green fields sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2590</a>	Extended Lea Castle site	Support	<p>I believe that a better option is for the brownfield site of Lea Castle to be developed to meet Kidderminster’s needs, this makes much more sense as it is close to the 449 Wolverhampton Road and would eliminate the need for a very expensive bypass. The development would be large enough to serve a small primary school and feed on into the secondary school at Wolverley which has the capacity to take the children.</p> <p>With shops and doctors added it would become a desirable place for families to live.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2918</a>	Lea Castle	Comment	Lea Castle would be perfect for this kind of development and work along the lines of Spennells. Also, this would benefit Wolverley High School and provide increased pupil numbers for them wouldn't it?
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO1202</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Surplus land in the control of Stourport High School should be allocated for development. Reasons to support this proposed allocation:

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stourport High School is in significant need of funding to repair and replace dilapidated buildings. Insufficient grant funding to undertake the substantial building work required to the school. The school are, therefore, in a position where they are having to generate their own funds. Intention of the school to pursue a residential planning permission on surplus land in their control and sell it to a developer. This funding will then be used to assist the funding of the building and repair works. It will improve the facilities available to the school’s pupils and safeguard the future of the school for years to come.</li> <li>• No other allocation within Stourport will have similar benefits, only site where money generated from the development will directly fund a community facility.</li> <li>• The site has clear and strong defensible boundaries.</li> <li>• Proportion of the site is previously developed land. Paragraph 89 of the Framework allows for the limited infilling or partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land. whether redundant or in continuing use, which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt for the purposes of including land within it. The proposed residential development on the previously developed section of the site will have a reduced footprint in height compared to the Sixth Form building.</li> <li>• There is significant development to the north east of the site that helps define the built up edge of Stourport. Development in this location will not, therefore, erode the perceived gap between Kidderminster and Stourport.</li> </ul> <p>The above factors, when taken in combination, constitute ‘exceptional circumstances’ that justify the release of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation for residential development.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site is appropriate location for development. The surplus land in the control of the school is in a less important Green Belt location than Wyre Forest Golf Club (LI/2). It is disappointing that the land in the control of the school has not been assessed through the Council’ Green Belt Assessment, as it was previously advised by Officers that that would be the case. The surplus land in the control of the school is better related to the built up extent of Stourport. It will not have such a significant impact in terms of reducing the gap between Stourport and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The various proposed allocations at Stourport will result in the population of the settlement increasing placing additional pressures on the school. The additional funding generated by the sale of the site of the housing will help improve the school facilities and assist in meeting the increased number of pupils.</li> </ul> <p>The site is in a suitable and sustainable location for development, performs a highly limited Green Belt role and is the only site that the site promoters are aware of that have direct tangible social benefits. The site should be allocated for development in the emerging Plan.</p>
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO869</a>	Site submitted - Land off Coniston Crescent, Stourport	Comment	Call for sites form submitted for land off Coniston Crescent, Stourport-on-Severn.
Strong Farms (LS) Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO878</a>	Site submitted - Stour Corridor/Lea Castle, Wolverley	Comment	Call for Sites form submitted - Stour Corridor/Lea Castle, Wolverley.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	<a href="#">LPPO926</a>	Site submitted - Kidderminster Harriers Football Ground	Comment	Call for sites form submitted for Kidderminster Harriers Football Stadium - To allocate for housing the existing Aggborough Stadium & adjacent car park. This combined site is estimated to be 2.38 hectares, thus has a potential capacity for around 96 new dwellings assuming a density of approximately 40 units /ha.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Housing in this close to town centre location would reduce the need to allocate other sites elsewhere in the district particularly those lying beyond the existing built up areas of the town and in Green Belt. The submission of this site for consideration for potential residential development is conditional upon the successful relocation of the current Kidderminster Harriers use to a suitable alternative site which will meet the club’s future needs.</p> <p>The existing Aggborough Stadium and car park is a town site within easy walking distance from the rail station Kidderminster Station (approx.0.5 miles). Housing development here would help reduce the extent of encroachment into Green Belt currently proposed in the new Local Plan (Core Housing sites, as well as both options A &amp; B). Housing on the outskirts of town currently proposed would not necessarily have the opportunity to be as well integrated into the existing Kidderminster town and the services/retail offer that a closer town centre location (i.e. the Aggborough site) would provide.</p> <p>Housing on the site would be more compatible with existing neighbouring uses, these being predominantly residential.</p> <p>The site is not subject to any particular designations that would otherwise impinge on redevelopment here. For example, it is not within a Conservation Area, there are no listed buildings or Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) and there are no flooding issues.</p> <p>The relocation of the existing football club to the new facilities south of Kidderminster will not happen immediately, but, with appropriate planning policies in place, could take place within the first five years of the proposed Local Plan period, thus freeing up this site for the required housing.</p>
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	<a href="#">LPPO995</a>	6.57 - Kidderminster Harriers Stadium	Comment	<p>To support development on previously developed land before land with greater environmental or amenity value, in accordance with NPPF para’s 110 – 111. Add to list of Core Sites for allocation:  <u>Aggborough Stadium and car park site for housing (total approx.96 units). Not</u></p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<u>currently in Green Belt so removal is not necessary.</u>
	<a href="#">LPPO2390</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Object	We feel that a development on ground such as the old Glades Leisure Centre site or maybe the Cermaspeed site would be much more advantageous and would also enhance the town centre. There is no enhancement to be found by adding such a large number of council properties to a very small village.
	<a href="#">LPPO2540</a>	6.57	Comment	There are lots of sites in Kidderminster , i.e., the grounds of Sion Hill school, Sion Hill, Sladen School, Hurcott Road. where people can get a school place, into a doctors surgery, regular buses & walk into Kidderminster town centre where they may work.
	<a href="#">LPPO2690</a>	Selba Drive	Object	<p>I was dismayed to learn that "Land Off Selba Drive" (reference number BHS/22) is included in the Local Plan Review as suitable for housing development.</p> <p>I wish to strongly object to this, on the grounds of overcrowding of access routes and the terrible erosion of local amenities.</p> <p>For decades, this open land has been widely used by children of all ages, families and dogwalkers. As it is adjacent to the Selba Drive cul-de-sac, it is a safe area for children to play in sight of a number of homes and with no through access and therefore few cars. There is no other such area on Habberley estate. To build on this land would be to deprive the whole community of a valuable and much-needed recreational area.</p> <p>With the recent redevelopment of the Cooper's Arms public house and adjacent church and church hall, the land in question will be even more in demand for use by locals. The closing down of the public house, church and church hall leave precious few local amenities in the area, making this land an even more precious community resource.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Access to Selba Drive is already difficult, with the adjacent Westminster Drive now very crowded with cars. When the new houses on the public house and church site are occupied, increasing pressure will be put on the area from parked vehicles and from traffic. The development of the open land next to Selba Drive would dramatically worsen this problem.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2235</a></p>	<p>Para 6.57</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>If Greenfield sites are made available to developers, there is danger that they will be used, because they are easier to build upon and present a better profit margin, while the blight zones around our towns remain. The council should take steps to ensure that all brownfield sites, such as the Sion Hill school site and the area adjacent to Tesco in Stourport are developed. Pressure should be put upon landowners not allowing their properties to be developed because they hope for greater profit. The many derelict buildings around the town centre, such as the old Law Court building, disused factories in Green Street and Park Lane, the old Woolworths and BHS buildings could be made into truly affordable apartments for first time buyers and provide social housing. Inclusion of Green Belt in the plan should not be considered until all of the brownfield sites have been used.</p> <p>Housing development around the town centre would help to regenerate Kidderminster whereas development almost two miles away on the edge of the town will not. People living in the town would have easy access to the town and to the station. There would be less car journeys and less pollution. <b>Option B better meets this need.</b></p> <p>I am glad that steps are finally being taken to develop the waterfront areas in Kidderminster but when is the eyesore, Crown House (the old Post Office building), going to be addressed?</p> <p>I do not feel that the proposed cinema on the Glades site will help to regenerate the centre of the town. It will further draw attention away from the centre. This</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>area could better be used for housing, including housing for the elderly within walking distance of shops, restaurants, doctors, opticians, dentists etc.</p> <p>High property taxes have driven many small businesses away from Kidderminster town centre. Can the council find a way to reduce property taxes to encourage small retail businesses back into the town and improve local economy?</p> <p><b>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 Corbet and Wolverley, rather than focusing upon the area joining the east of Kidderminster. The plan should be revised to include this option.</b></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2254</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>The whole of the Wyre Forest including outlying villages like Wolverley, Blakedown, Chaddesley Corbett should be included within these proposals and any development spread across the whole district to ensure that urban sprawl is contained and building is within existing boundaries.</p> <p>The Government is not in favour of developing green field sites unless it is a last resort. There are many brownfield sites within the area that should be developed, some of which already have planning permission but are being held as land banks. The Council should not allow this and should lobby Parliament to ensure this is against the law.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2558</a>	Site suggestion - extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>The alternative that I would please ask you to consider is the Lea Castle area. This is already an existing built upon site which could be expanded to create a brand new community. Why not create a new part of Kidderminster with a new school, shops, play area, pub which would be far more appealing to people moving to the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				area?
	<a href="#">LPPO1923</a>	New site suggestion Wolverley.	Comment	There are brownfield 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO3061</a>	Para 6.57	Comment	<b>Suggested areas for development</b>  Development around existing housing estates in the North of the district; Ferndale, Habberley, Franche and in the South East; Offmoor, Spennells, Stanklyn would develop the Wyre Forest area along a North-South axis and not merely provide commuter residences for other districts to the East. Developing and regenerating the town centre would create a more natural demand for housing from the indigenous population, while attracting a younger element that would be attracted to a vibrant district hub. Building a large number of houses along the eastern edge of the district would not encourage growth from within.
	<a href="#">LPPO2483</a>	Lea Castle	Support	I think there is enough housing in Kidderminster. But if there is a need for more, why not housing like mobile homes, modern, compact but permanent with communal laundries and gardens.
	<a href="#">LPPO1967</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lea Castle would be most appropriate for development.</li> <li>• A community could be set up.</li> <li>• Main road surround the site.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1995</a>	Lea Castle Hospital Extension	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Lea Castle site would be a better option.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1837</a>	Lea Castle Hospital	Support	Supports extended Lea Castle Development.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
		Extension		
	<a href="#">LPPO2629</a>	6.57 - Alternative site	Comment	<p>As an alternative, we propose that the Local Plan includes ALL brownfield sites, developed to their maximum potential, especially the former school sites, and specifically a larger scale development on the former Lea Castle site and small amount of attached green fields, which we feel could support a 200-2500 home development. This site would facilitate the the building of a primary school, development of community facilities and a community heart as well as improving the longer term viability of Wolverley Secondary School. It would also provide a larger financial contribution to infrastructure. This development would not adversely impact on the existing Cookley village community, but would mean a regular bus service would be very viable. The derelict, disused Lea Castle site would become a vibrant community for the future.</p> <p>Development should also be actively pursued on the north western area of Kidderminster, e.g. extending housing development in the Ferndale area.</p> <p>We feel that these proposals would not only provide merely the sites for housing development, but sites which are sustainable, attractive and enhance the Wyre Forest as a whole.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2659</a>	Callow Hill	Comment	<p>We feel the land is ideally suited for a small development (two detached houses affordable to second time buyers).</p> <p>Two modern detached house have been built opposite and there has been small infill development across the road on the main Kidderminster to Tenbury road. We know of many families looking to move out of first time buyer properties to a more rural location therefore freeing affordable properties at the bottom end of the market.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				This project would provide valuable accommodation to help with the housing crisis in the area. This area would particularly benefit from young families moving into it providing a healthy wide spread age band of residents therefore enhancing the community spirit.
	<a href="#">LPPO2672</a>	Lea Castle	Support	<p>There is a particular need for more homes for one or two person households, and for people who need genuinely affordable homes, including social housing.</p> <p>I understand that one of the possibilities would be a development of the Lea Castle site. The site is large enough to support a community with a primary school and local shops and facilities, and a community of that size should also be able to support a regular bus service.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1461</a>	Lea Castle Sustainable Village	Support	<p>Supports Lea Castle site being developed as it already has services such as power, phone connections etc. from past use.</p> <p>If it were to be developed would like us to overcome some issues such as traffic.</p>
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPPO1488</a>	Additional Brownfield Sites - Kidderminster Town Centre	Comment	<p>The Council must make more effort in identifying suitable brownfield sites.</p> <p>The Council has made a number of attempts to attract more retailers to Kidderminster over the last few years, with limited success. It is clear that it is becoming more difficult for high street retailers to compete with Internet services in all but a few markets, but there is no recognition of this in the Plan. The trend nationwide is for a decline in the number of banks, building societies, estate agents etc. which make up many of the businesses in town centres. Kidderminster town centre has at least 40 large shops and office blocks that stand empty, some for well over a decade. The town centre is in urgent need of regeneration. We believe that Compulsory Purchase Orders should be made on some of the larger vacant shops. Planning needs to accept that the amount of shop frontage in Kidderminster is in excess of need and the area associated with retail and related</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>businesses in Kidderminster town centre be downsized to reflect likely future demand, and areas surplus to retail, such as Worcester Street, converted to apartments with some mixed use.</p> <p>Crown house on the Bull Ring in Kidderminster and the timber yard on Park Lane are significant examples of brownfield sites which should be in the Local Plan. Should the land owner not be amenable to housing development then we urge the use of Compulsory Purchase Orders.</p>
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPPO1492</a>	Site suggestion - Wyre Forest Golf course	Comment	Stourport also has a number of Brownfield sites which are in need of development in order to meet some of the local housing needs of a growing/developing town centre. The now defunct Wyre Forest golf course has released some land and there is no reason why the whole of it should not be released for housing development. Growth of Stourport will require improvement in infrastructure, in particular public and private transport provision.
	<a href="#">LPPO2184</a>	East of Kidderminster - Lea Castle	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Lea Castle Extension.</li> <li>• Would be able to sustain many houses, a school etc. which is badly needed.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2791</a>	6.57 Kidderminster town centre	Support	I would suggest that a large proportion of the existing retail zone in the centre of Kidderminster, in which properties are currently vacant, could 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO2793</a>	6.57 Kidderminster town centre	Support	I am shocked by the state of Kidderminster town centre. It is very run down with derelict sites and empty buildings. Surely these sites should be used for housing before any green sites are even considered. Wyre Forest Council should be ashamed of the state of Kidderminster town centre, and it should be a top priority for any development.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2794</a>	6.57 Kidderminster town centre	Support	There are brownfield sites in the centre of Kidderminster which should be used to alleviate housing shortages, thereby improving the appalling state of the present town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO2210</a>	Extended Lea Castle and Ferndale	Comment	Develop land at Lea Castle, with a new school/shops, as a standalone community. Also fully utilise the sites of Sion Hill School/former Sladen School and develop land to the west of Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill. Land to the north/west of Kidderminster (Ferndale) should also be considered.
	<a href="#">LPPO1813</a>	Alternatives	Comment	There are plenty of Brown sites around WFDC area you have the old school of Sion Hill/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.
	<a href="#">LPPO1847</a>	Lea Castle	Support	I totally support Lea Castle sustainable village.
	<a href="#">LPPO2846</a>	Selba Drive	Object	<p>We wish to <u>object</u> in the strongest possible way to the inclusion and any consideration given to the “Land off Selba Drive — Kidderminster” in the local plan review.</p> <p>Any building work on this land will severely disrupt an important local community amenity with no substitute in the surrounding area. I will, in particular, draw your attention to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daily, children of all ages play on the field. It is a safe area as there isn't any through traffic and there is an infrequent movement of vehicles in the cul-de-sac. Other green areas in and around the Habberley Estate are designated 'No Ball Games' and not big enough.</li> <li>• It is used daily by local people to walk their dogs, to exercise and to relax with friends.</li> <li>• Habberley Estate has little or no identified play areas that are easily and safely accessible by children and parents.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure on Selba Drive would have to be revised. Any extra volume of traffic would have a detrimental effect on residents and the environment; this would have to be negated. Drainage would also have to be repurposed, currently rainwater from Selba Drive and the Habberley estate drains onto the road and into the field, causing some flooding. Without this run off, the effect on the existing residents could be catastrophic.</li> <li>• At a time when our population needs more open, green areas, this open green area is being considered for development.</li> <li>• We are of the understanding that when the original Kdderminster Self Build Association, who built the houses on Selba Drive, gave land to WFDC, it was to be used as open use land and not to be built on. We are currently waiting on a freedom of information request and pursuing the documentary evidence of this.</li> </ul> <p>We very much hope that this area is removed from the local plan.</p>
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1431</a>	para.6.57 additional sites	Comment	<p>Gladman believe there is a clear need to plan for more housing allocations than set out in options A &amp; B. Large-scale sites proposed require release from Green Belt plus significant upfront infrastructure. Need to ensure there are no shortfalls in housing provision, especially in early years.</p> <p>BW believe OAHN should be 332 dpa. There are also clear links with Black Country and wider Worcestershire area. Also more flexibility should be built in to allow for sites not coming forward as anticipated. A 20% uplift is often suggested by Local Plan Inspectors.</p> <p>Suggest that site selection process is revisited and additional allocations made. This will help to secure rolling 5 year housing supply.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1435</a>	Additional site - Areley Common	Support	Gladman seeks allocation of land at Areley Common (8.32Ha) which straddles boundary with Malvern Hills DC. 0.9Ha is in WFDC. The consideration of sites alongside the District's main settlements is vitally important and in cases where administrative boundaries run close to the settlement edge, it is vital that this is effectively managed through the duty-to-cooperate in local plan making. HELAA (AKR/13) considered development was achievable. Outline application 17/0045/OUTL proposed up to 125 dwellings plus C2. The site is well contained with defensible boundaries including hedgerow to the southern boundary, woodland to the east and existing residential development to the north and west. In accordance with NPPF the site is deliverable, available and offers a suitable location for development now.
Strong Farms	<a href="#">LPPO870</a>	Site submitted - Land off Castle Road, to the South of Cookley	Comment	Call for sites form submitted - Land off Castle Road, to the South of Cookley.
Strong Farms	<a href="#">LPPO871</a>	Site submitted - The Barracks, Wolverley Road, Wolverley	Comment	Call for sites form submitted - The Barracks, Wolverley Road, Wolverley.
Yew Tree Walk Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO745</a>	Site submitted - Yew Tree Walk, Stourport	Comment	<p>Call for sites submission - Land at Yew Tree Walk, Stourport.</p> <p>The site was previously put forward in response to the Council's call for sites and was included in the Council's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment 2016 (HELAA). The HELAA identifies that the site is previously developed land (PDL) (a brownfield site) and that it is within the Green Belt. As this site at Yew Tree Walk is PDL, it is therefore requested that it be included on the brownfield register that is being prepared for Wyre Forest.</p> <p>The HELAA 2016 also identifies that 18% of the site is covered by a TPO (2013) and 25% of the site is within Flood Zone 3. Note that these proportions are based on the red line area that was submitted as part of the call for sites. The</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Promotional document submitted demonstrate through an Illustrative Masterplan that residential development can come forward on the majority of this site outside of the areas covered by the TPO and Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>The Preferred Option Sustainability Appraisal scores the site well against a number of objectives, including improving health and well-being, improving and enhancing the provision and accessibility to local services, meeting housing needs, promoting energy efficiency, protecting agricultural land, protecting and enhancing landscape/townscape and also maintaining and enhancing community and settlement identities. The SA does however score the site a major negative with regards to flood risk and a minor negative with regards to biodiversity. This scoring is based on the red line area contained within the HELAA.</p> <p>Informed by the SA and HELAA, para 6.47 of the Local Plan Review Preferred Options Document (June 2017) sets out that sites which are considered unsuitable (for example because of flood risk), are not viable or not deliverable have been excluded from the preferred options. Yew Tree Walk, is not currently identified as a preferred allocation in the Local Plan Preferred Options Document. In line with para 6.47 of the Preferred Options Document it is assumed that despite the site being PDL and appropriate for Green Belt release, the site has been discounted due to the fact the evidence base identifies the site as unsuitable given it is partly located in Flood Zone 3 and partly covered by a TPO. Such an assessment has been based on the red line area submitted to the call for sites which does not reflect the actual developable area of the site. In reality the Flood Zone 3 and TPO constraints do not cover the majority of the site. Sites should not just be discounted because part of the site falls within Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>The majority of the site is unconstrained PDL. The Illustrative Masterplan submitted as part of these representations demonstrates how a suitable residential development can come forward on this site. The red line area has now been revised from that shown in the HELAA to more accurately reflect the developable area of the site. This change to the red line is set out in the Promotional Document and sets out that built development can come forward</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>outside of the constrained areas. In light of this change the Council should revisit the sites scoring in the SA and reconsider this brownfield site for allocation. Note that this change has no impact upon the capacity of the site.</p> <p>The HELAA 2016 identifies that access would need to be through the adjacent housing estate off Yew Tree Walk. A Transport Technical Note has now been prepared by WSP which has been submitted as part of these representations. This note establishes that access from Yew Tree Walk can be provided for a proposed development of up to 85 dwellings.</p> <p>The site at Yew Tree Walk is sustainably located, is PDL and is on the edge of Stourport-on-Severn. The site is within the Green Belt, however in the context of the need to release land from the Green Belt to meet housing needs, it has been demonstrated that the release of this site would not compromise the role of the Green Belt. Given that development should be targeted towards Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn as the principle settlements, Green Belt sites such as Yew Tree Walk which are in sustainable locations, are unconstrained (as demonstrated in this letter), and particularly those which are PDL, should therefore be identified as suitable residential allocations through the Local Plan Review.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2419</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Object	<p>There are so many sites in Kidderminster which can be built upon or regenerated. Spread out over a wider less destructive plan and included in option B. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sladen school site</li> <li>• Sion Hill school site</li> <li>• Huge empty previously "sea line" unit of the A442 Worcester road</li> <li>• The old glades site (we don't need a cinema) Council have said it themselves we need homes on brownfield sites first.</li> <li>• Old brintons carpet site</li> <li>• Crown House</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• empty shops down the complete length of High Street. The empty previously "Barber-Ella hair salon" unit and flats opposite the town hall.</li> <li>• Soon to be empty Debenhams building in weavers wharf</li> </ul> <p>This would create a wonderful canal side residential town much like the Birmingham canal site which is thriving with bars and shops.</p> <p>Lets regenerate our town in a more modern less destructive way and bring young commuters in this way, who live in the centre, next to shops, bars, restaurants, and the train station.</p> <p>This would prevent traffic issues, over development of the already large Spennells estate. Spreading out the need for doctors, schools and policing needs evenly.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO868</a>	Site submitted - Adj. Red Lion Court, Bridgnorth Road, Arley	Comment	<p>Call for sites submitted - Adjacent to Red Lion Court, Bridgnorth Road, Arley. Former overflow car park for the Red Lion Inn (Red Lion Inn falls into Shropshire and has been developed for residential).</p> <p>The WFDC Core Strategy identifies the need for affordable housing and highlights a shortage as being a particular issue in the rural areas of the District where average house prices are highest. Policy CP04 encourages a proactive approach within rural areas. Furthermore policy DS04 again highlights the pressing need for affordable housing in the District's villages, rural settlements and other rural hamlets.</p> <p>The Wyre Forest Site Allocations includes policy SAL.DPL2 which identifies affordable housing in response to an identified local need being permitted as an exception to the general presumption against residential development in rural locations.</p> <p>Having established in the Core Strategy that there is a shortfall of affordable housing with the District overall, and furthermore, that the pressing need is felt most acutely in rural areas I would welcome your view of this site being advanced</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				as a rural exception site for affordable housing. I am also aware that the recent Housing Bill seeks to promote automatic planning permission in principle on brownfield sites to bring forward more land to build new homes quicker.
	<a href="#">LPPO1824</a>	6.57	Comment	Have all the brownfield sites in the Wolverley / Cookley area been explored e.g Brown Westhead Park and the area on the opposite side of the road which I believe was the site of the Old Quarry? The same demands would be made on infrastructure but surely it makes sense to look at these areas rather any Green Belt locations.
	<a href="#">LPPO756</a>	6.57	Comment	Why not include the section of land opposite Bunkers Hill i.e. the Eastern Section in Core Site? Not Highclere? Already planning permission for Safari Park Development on Bunkers Hill so would seem logical.
	<a href="#">LPPO704</a>	Site submitted - North of Birmingham Road, Kidderminster	Comment	<p>Suggests site north of Birmingham Road, Kidderminster, located opposite core employment site WFR/CB/7. The land identified extends to approximately 8.9ha. Further land to the north and west could also be available.</p> <p>We confirm our clients are positive in respect of gateway development for the approach to Kidderminster on the Birmingham Road. The land area identified could provide a mixed use opportunity of employment generation, residential and/or retail as part of the overall development to the east of Kidderminster. Accessibility by virtue is excellent, land area is flat and available at short notice.</p>
Price, Price, Findley & Dormer	<a href="#">LPPO705</a>	Site submitted - Land off Snuff Mill Walk, Bewdley	Comment	<p>Suggests new site - Land off Snuff Mill Walk, Bewdley.</p> <p>There is an area of underutilised land extending to approximately 3.5ha adjacent to the Bewdley Town centre boundary, as shown edged in red on the attached plan. Existing residential development adjoins, but the topography of the site would make development unobtrusive to neighbours. A sympathetic low density scheme would be proposed looking to complement the adjacent conservation site,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				with particular thought to retirement accommodation that is needed within Bewdley. Topography limitations and preservation of screening and natural features further benefits the site and would give ample opportunity for amenity areas to be created in association with such a scheme. This site is envisaged to be suitable for low density development.
Hardwick & Prosser	<a href="#">LPPO714</a>	Site submitted - 164 and 165 Sutton Park Road, Kidderminster	Comment	<p>The draft documentation, paragraph 6.2, acknowledges that it will not be possible to be entirely reliant on brownfield land. There will be a requirement for greenfield land take and it is preferable to create a scheme, such as that proposed at Sutton Park Road, within a residential development boundary, surrounded by residential use and in a sustainable location in comparison to releasing greenfield sites such as fields which adjoin a residential development boundary. For this reason we believe the site (164/165 Sutton Park Road) would be preferable to some options in the consultation document.</p> <p>This site, as a whole, would create a good boost to local housing supply as well as a viable scheme for a developer assisting its delivery. It is important to bring forward allocations of varying sizes too in order to allow varying builders and/or developer to bring them forward to create a variation of sites available in terms of design, layout and pricing to create some variety for the market.</p> <p>I note, from a previous application on 165 Sutton Park Road (acknowledged in the attached form), that an application for residential use was recommended at committee for refusal but I believe it was withdrawn, The reasons for refusal varied but essentially the application was very poorly put together - submitting too many dwellings on the plot and failing to leave sufficient space for access, parking turning as well as being unable to comply with the relevant design guides at the time. Any new proposal should be viewed on its merits and not with this previous history in mind. It is noted that there are a number of TPOs on site but it is not to say, given the larger site, that these cannot be successfully retained with the guidance of a qualified arboriculturalist.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Furthermore I note there was concerns over access. Having spoken to planning officers about this site, during pre-application advice, it was considered there may be overall potential as part of a land assembly project which could include The Grange (Care Home for the Elderly) which adjoins the site. It is also understood that no. 163 has queried potential for development of this site. Overall — 164 and 165 Sutton Park Road could contribute to a successful housing scheme as has been the case in recent years off Sutton Park Road (examples including The Croft). Overall this site is one which represents a sustainable location for development with minimal impact or impacts which could successfully be mitigated.</p>
Peacock & Devitt	<a href="#">LPPO710</a>	Site submitted - Land South of Fairfield Lane, Wolverley	Comment	Call for sites submitted - Land South of Fairfield Lane, Wolverley.
	<a href="#">LPPO711</a>	Site submitted - Bentley Grove, Curslow Lane, Kidderminster	Comment	<p>Call for sites form submitted for land adjacent to Bentley Grove, Curslow Lane.</p> <p>This land is delineated on the attached plan. The land edged blue comprises a single dwelling and its curtilage; and the land edged red is managed grassland. These representations relate to both parcels.</p> <p>The land does not feature in the Council’s 2016 Housing &amp; Economic Land Availability Assessment but the owner is keen to see the land brought forward for development as soon as possible.</p> <p>Published evidence &amp; other material which informs the Preferred Options demonstrates that there is a clear need to allocate a substantial amount of additional land for new housing; and that this need cannot be met without releasing for development a significant amount of land that is currently within the Green Belt.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>The Council’s approach to addressing this challenge needs to consider all options available and the potential of releasing land in the Green Belt which is of little functional value or landscape importance should be seriously explored. New housing can help sustain currently less than sustainable patterns of development, for example by making public transport serving the existing network of rural settlements more viable and by supporting local businesses &amp; services.</p> <p>Such development at a relatively modest scale would not detract from the thrust of whatever overarching spatial strategy is pursued and should be supported as making a positive contribution to meeting both rural policy objectives and Borough wide housing needs.</p> <p>The land at Bentley Grove provides a good example of where such development could take place. The site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lies within the hamlet of Mustow Green close to the villages of Harvington and Chaddesley Corbett and its development would help sustain those settlements, notably by improving the viability of existing bus services (42 &amp; 133) which run through the area to Kidderminster &amp; Bromsgrove and by supporting local businesses &amp; schools</li> <li>• is of little functional or landscape value, containing no productive farmland or mature trees or hedgerows</li> <li>• could be easily accessed from either Curslow Lane and/or Bromsgrove Road and has no known physical or other constraints on development</li> </ul> <p>Therefore the Council is urged to give positive consideration to the allocation of the land known as Bentley Grove for residential development in the Local Plan Review.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO713</a>	Site submitted - Land	Comment	Call for sites for submitted for Land adjacent to The Wain House, Lye Head, Rock

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
		adjacent to The Wain House, Lye Head, Rock		
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPPO733</a>	Site submitted - Severn Grove, Kidderminster	Comment	Call for sites form submitted - Severn Grove, Kidderminster
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPPO735</a>	Site submitted - Queens Road, Stourport	Comment	Call for sites form submitted - Queens Road, Stourport
	<a href="#">LPPO2421</a>	Alternative sites - brownfield	Comment	<p>Plan 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.”</p> <p>There are brownfield sites not in the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2857</a>	Alternative Options	Comment	Brownfield sites could create housing developments. New housing must be affordable for local young people trying to get onto the property ladder. Flats and apartments in empty shops in Kidderminster town centre would be better. Build bungalows to free up family homes. Do not destroy our countryside.
	<a href="#">LPPO2862</a>	Proposed alternatives	Comment	Plans not focused on need for centralised high density housing in Kidderminster rather than low density housing on greenfield land. Half of the tower blocks were demolished in the Horsefair. 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. The plan should promote centralised housing development that reduces the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				dependency on car travel and lowers Co2.  Rural bus service in Cookley has been threatened. If more people live out of town we are not solving the travel issue or supporting the communities requirements for easy travel to work/school.
	<a href="#">LPPO2889</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	I would support a 'Spennells type' development on the Lea Castle site, expanding the current proposal. A full development on that site would support a primary school. Creating a 'second Spennells' on the Lea castle site would have less impact on local residents as it could be self-sustaining providing shops and live/work units providing employment opportunities. Lea Castle site has better road access, between two A roads it already has the necessary road infrastructure as the Wolverhampton Road and Stourbridge Road are already linked. This means there would be no 'rat runs' created through residential streets.
	<a href="#">LPPO1899</a>	Lea Castle	Comment	I propose that the new development should be built on the Lea Castle site as this would then connect with the Wolverhampton Road, allowing a small community to be built that would be large enough to support a primary school and be able to have a better bus route and create a village atmosphere. It would also be in the Wolverley High school catchment area which would allow the school to prosper too.
	<a href="#">LPPO2636</a>	Alternative sites	Comment	I would like to suggest the following sites be added into the core plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The whole of Worcester Street from Coventry Street up to the old magistrates court. This area of Kidderminster's town centre is currently 'dead'. Redeveloping these empty shop units as housing would revitalise other areas of the town centre, making it a more vibrant place to visit.</li> <li>• Disused factories at various sites including Green Street and Park Lane.</li> <li>• In Bridge Street Stourport, the large retail unit formerly occupied as an</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				indoor market. It has been empty for several years and is now in a state of chronic disrepair. It would therefore be an ideal site to develop, similarly to what WFDC are currently doing in nearby New Street.
	<a href="#">LPPO2812</a>	Extended Lea Castle Site	Support	Support proposals for a Lea Castle Sustainable Village which is an option that should be considered
Strong Farms (LS) Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO873</a>	Site submitted - ExCamp, Land Off Brown Westhead Park Road, Wolverley	Comment	Call for Sites form submitted for ExCamp, Land Off Brown Westhead Park Road, Wolverley.
	<a href="#">LPPO2920</a>	6.57 Alternative options	Support	If really necessary the old Lea Castle site could be used for affordable housing, as all the Utilities are in place, along with a road structure. A new school could be built on the old Sion Hill site, providing education for children on the new estate.
	<a href="#">LPPO2393</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>The amount of building proposed seems excessive. I can't see many people wanting to move into Kidderminster unless the town has more to offer them. Parts of the town have been neglected for far too long and have become an eyesore. Many people use Kidderminster for the large supermarkets and little else.</p> <p>If it is really necessary to build in such numbers, I don't understand why the plans do not include much more building of homes and employment opportunities in the town centre. If the population is going to increase vastly, then the town has to be improved. If houses are built round about, I fear that the town will be even more soul less and become a commuter town with an empty centre.</p> <p>I welcome the improvements that are going to start soon to the railway station and this will be a big draw for commuters coming in and out of Kidderminster.</p> <p>On the plans, the Lea Castle site is marked for development. Why can't this area</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>be expanded to form a proper little village? It could have a primary school, a few shops, a GP surgery and a starter industrial units. Major roads are already there, and a bus service would also be viable. This would avoid all the strain that building in soul less patches around the town would cause. The school at Offmore is full to capacity the GP surgeries are all stretched. If planned properly Lea Castle village could have a heart with a purpose built school, a medical centre. It could become a place where families really would choose to live, work, and play.</p> <p>It seems that there is no plan to develop the north west of Kidderminster, I can't understand this.</p> <p>I support the call for the use of brown sites in and around the town of Kidderminster and also a village in and around the Lea Castle site.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2423</a>	Selba Drive	Object	<p>I was disturbed to discover that under the Local Plan review so many smaller sites were being included for consideration without any mention to those living close by.</p> <p>I therefore wish to strongly object to the inclusion of the "Land Off Selba Drive" HELAA Reference number: BHS/22. I am objecting on the grounds of <u>poor access</u> and what I consider to be a <u>dangerous erosion of local amenities</u>.</p> <p>With the removal of the public house, the Catholic Church and St Johns annex there is no longer any facility within the Habberley estate apart from the private club and a small scout hut. The Habberley estate has lost a venue for people to meet and congregate, removing any exercise or family option's, from coffee mornings and parties through to Zumba, all have now disappeared.</p> <p>And now there are plans to remove the only free open space on the estate where children can safely play within hailing distance and in reasonable view of a good</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>number of homes.</p> <p>Land used for exercising the dog, playing cricket and football so to remove this amenity would be a considerable loss to this area, once again forcing people to take transport to go outside of the local area, using their cars and thus contributing to a negative environmental impact within the Wyre Forest district area.</p> <p>Residents would also suffer from the addition of extra vehicles on already overcrowded roads with people parking on pavements, verges and anywhere else they can find that is safe to leave their vehicles.</p> <p>Selba Drive and the roads that lead to it are not wide enough to provide access for the additional cars and people. Westminster Drive is almost none negotiable on occasions and there is the expectation of extra vehicles parking on Truro drive and Canterbury Road generated by the occupation of the new homes on the old pub site. Making the fearful prospect of Emergency vehicles being unable to reach properties at those crucial times, when so often needed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2168</a>	6.57	Comment	Brownfield sites should be looked: Sion Hill School, The lion's Fields and Crown House.
	<a href="#">LPPO2186</a>	New area suggested - Blakedown	Comment	If there is an absolute necessity for housing I believe the area surrounding Blakedown should be considered – there are existing transport links to Birmingham and Worcester from there.
	<a href="#">LPPO2648</a>	Lea Castle - whole site	Support	If more houses are needed I propose they are built on the Lea Castle site creating a self contained village with its own school, shops and GP practice. But I believe there needs to be much more investment in the local NHS to support more people moving in.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2308</a>	Alternatives	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• brownfield sites should be developed first</li> <li>• In town centre empty shops used for housing as the need for retail units is diminishing .</li> <li>• jobs are required, currently there are empty factory units ie easter park.offices are empty in green st.</li> <li>• Housing needs to run in conjunction with employment</li> <li>• Do something about employment.</li> <li>• Preserve Green Belt not build on it.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2587</a>	6.57 Alternative Sites	Object	<p>As an alternative I would like to propose the use of land at Lea Castle, this could be extended to use land up to the Wolverhampton Road and at the rear of the Lea Castle site, extending up to Axborough Lane. There could also be some development on the Western side of Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill which would link with the development at the Sion Hill Middle School site.</p> <p>This development could create a sustainable village with all the required infrastructure to support it, a village centre and a primary school. The village would be able to sustain a bus service and would not impact on the community of Cookley.</p> <p>In addition to this I feel that, WFDC should propose some degree of development on the north/west of Kidderminster and feel it would be reasonable to develop land at the rear of the existing Ferndale estate which could accommodate 100-200 houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1462</a>	Lea Castle Sustainable Village - Policy 31	Support	Supports Lea Castle Sustainable Village.
	<a href="#">LPPO2601</a>	6.57 Alternative Sites	Object	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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				trips into the town.  Other sites already have existing plumbing and sewerage - Lea Castle, Sladen School site, Sion Hill school site, industrial units off Stourport Road, other disused factory sites within central Kidderminster.  These other sites are an eyesore, that attracts 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?  The majority of employment is based nearer other parts of Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO2080</a>	East of Kidderminster - Lea Castle Extension	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports Lea Castle site.</li> <li>• Could create sustainable community with new school and bus service.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2190</a>	Lea Castle	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lea Castle would be a better proposal.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1463</a>	Lea Castle Sustainable Village - Policy 31	Support	Feels Lea Castle Sustainable Village is the best option for new housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO2759</a>	6.57 Lea Castle	Support	<p>I think an alternative proposal to use the Lea Castle Site is more suitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is a larger site with room to include a central communal and commercial area,</li> <li>• It's size could provide many more houses, of varied size and price, and also support a large primary school within the catchment for Wolverhampton High.</li> <li>• It would not rely on one major road to access, nor major construction to provide sufficient access.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redevelopment of this site would provide an opportunity to use unused land in the true spirit of regeneration.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2788</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>Justification 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:</p> <p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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.</p> <p>I 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="#">LPPO2963</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>Development should be dispersed across the district as equally as possible so that no one area alone has to bear the brunt of the associated negatives. Use only greenfield sites where there is no public access to lessen impact on loss of recreational use.</p>
Offmore Comberton Action Group - Local Plans	<a href="#">LPPO1568</a>	Site suggestion - Rear of Ferndale Estate	Comment	<p>We believe WFDC are wrong not to propose ANY development on the North/West of Kidderminster. We feel that 100-200 houses could quite reasonably be developed at the rear of the existing Ferndale estate and would have easy access to the A449 at the Lea Castle cross roads.</p> <p>We believe that our alternatives will create viable and sustainable communities, protect valuable, productive farmland, preserve endangered bird species and other wildlife and, by prioritising Brownfield development, ensure that our towns</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				and town centres are viable and thriving.
	<a href="#">LPPO2946</a>	Lea Castle & Hurcott ADR	Support	<p>Advantages of alternative option at Lea Castle brownfield site and Hurcott ADR.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current proposals for Lea castle site are for only 600 houses and those proposals avoid rather than tackle the issue of underground tunnels at the site. Development would impact the residents of Cookley village, with increased need for primary school places and other facilities. If the development of Lea Castle site extended to Axborough Lane and included 2000 – 2500 houses, then this should provide enough profit to address the issues of the tunnels and would result in the development of a sustainable community with its own primary school, shops etc, similar to when Spennells was developed. This would support a village centre which whilst in Cookley Parish would not produce a burden on that community.</li> <li>• Where 2500 houses are developed the developers contribute to road improvement which could address the issues of Hurcott Lane / Hurcott Road.</li> <li>• The expansion of Lea Castle development would be capable of sustaining a bus service.</li> <li>• It would be in the catchment area of Wolverley High School which is currently undersubscribed and would positively impact on the schools long term viability.</li> <li>• A large site would also be able to provide a combination of affordable housing/social housing as well as Larger more executive homes ensuring that the housing needs of all residents and communities are met.</li> </ul> <p>I would also like to stress that WFDC should not build on any Green Belt land until all brownfield sites have been developed first. Consideration should also be given to regenerating the old part of Kidderminster town centre to utilise unused shops etc for conversion into flats/apartments. Why can't some of the existing retail</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				shops have accommodation converted above the premises similar to properties in London and other large cities. Weavers Wharf has been developed and regenerated. Young people would be attracted to living in a cosmopolitan type of community where residential flats/apartments are developed amongst restaurants, wine bars and coffee shops etc.
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPPO1685</a>	New Site Suggestions	Comment	<p>We recommend the inclusion in the Plan of the following sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severn Grove, Kidderminster - This site, owned by TCHG, is included in the site allocations policy but not referenced in the Local Plan Review we would expect to see its inclusion as a core site.</li> <li>• Queens Road, Stourport -This site, owned by TCHG, is included in the site allocations policy but not referenced in the Local Plan Review we would expect to see its inclusion as a core site.</li> <li>• Yew Tree Walk, Stourport – We are in discussion with the owner of this site and believe that the site should be incorporated into the Local Plan Review as a Core site.</li> <li>• Rock Works, Kidderminster – We are in discussion with the owner and believe that the site should be forward incorporated into the Local Plan Review as a Core site.</li> <li>• Selba Drive, Kidderminster – This site, owned by TCHG, should be incorporated into the Local Plan Review as a Core site.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO2002</a>	Lea Castle - Sustainable Village	Support	Supports the Lea Castle ‘Sustainable Village’ idea.
	<a href="#">LPPO2034</a>	Lea Castle - Sustainable Village	Support	Use Lea Castle site and Sion Hill School sites for Sustainable Village saving Green Belt land.
	<a href="#">LPPO2045</a>	Extended Lea Castle and	Support	<u>Lea Castle:</u> already has several access roads and is currently overgrown, underused

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
		Ferndale		<p>and a magnet for anti social behaviour.</p> <p>Could include school/would have less impact on the countryside and wildlife/negate cost of upgrading road system.</p> <p>Build houses not factories/industrial units</p> <p><u>Ferndale:</u> Support, smaller so less impact, no need to upgrade road.</p>
Spennells Against Further Expansion	<a href="#">LPPO1739</a>	New site suggestion	Comment	We are reliably informed that an offer to vacate Kidderminster Harriers Football Club has been made by the Club to the Council and has been put forward as additional land for housing development, conditional on the football club being allowed to move to the training ground as an alternative venue. We suggest this be added to the existing brownfield sites to be used for residential development.
Spennells Against Further Expansion	<a href="#">LPPO1741</a>	6.57 - site suggestion	Comment	Development of an entire rural village on Lea Castle Hospital and School site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4412</a>	Alternatives	Comment	I would challenge that not enough brownfield sites are available. There is still room for further development on the Silverwoods site and the Lea Castle campus. Also, Burlish Top Golf Course has been closed for about a year and, I believe, will not open again as a gold club viable for business venture, as there is already sufficient provision in the area. It is common knowledge that the golf course is not viable agricultural land as it is of very poor quality and would provide space for hundreds of homes (and possible school). There is also the old Parsons Chain site in Stourport, at present it is being used by Severn Trent Water to store pipes etc. for the Birmingham Relief Project. However, that will be completed in a couple of years at most, leaving the site empty again, I assume.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3268</a>	Brownfield	Support	Brownfield sites available not listed in the plan.  What about locating more development in other areas, such as Wolverley, Franche, Bewdley, Stourport and others?
	<a href="#">LPPO4583</a>	6.57	Comment	There are Brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park; and the site of the old quarry on the opposite side of the B4189 to the above site. 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4842</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	Alternative sites need to be given greater consideration, Eg brownfield sites esp Lea Castle.
	<a href="#">LPPO4610</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	An alternate option would be to develop the Lea Castle site increase some of the land to make it into a sustainable community. To develop an eastern bypass around the A449 / A450 junction which would help alleviate traffic / pollution along the Chester Road corridor.
	<a href="#">LPPO4399</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	Recommend that in achieving dispersal of housing, further areas are considered. For example Blakedown, conspicuous by its absence, has good rail connection with its station. Harvington & Chaddesley Corbett have good road connection to Birmingham, Bromsgrove & Worcester. All are capable of accommodating medium developments with little impact on the nature of the villages. The expanded Lea Castle site within Option B is preferable to the smaller allocation identified in Option A.
	<a href="#">LPPO4227</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Kidderminster has many brownfield sites to build on and the existing building on the old sugar beat site and for example the area where the Glades was sited which may bring life back to a what seems to be a dying town.
	<a href="#">LPPO4228</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Brownfield sites should be used first.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4778</a>	6.57 Alternative Sites	Comment	<p>I support the regeneration of the area around the former Glades and Magistrates Courts, principally for apartments. I 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. Additional shops and restaurants in this area are not desirable or economically sustainable. Many other attractive old and empty buildings are ideal for conversion to attractive town centre living.</p> <p>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. Stourport also has a number of brownfield sites which are in need of development in order to meet some of the local housing needs of a growing/developing town centre. The now defunct Wyre Forest golf course has released some land and there is no reason why the whole of it should not be released for housing development. Growth of Stourport will require improvement in infrastructure, in particular public and private transport provision.</p> <p>Consideration should be made of small-scale development at Blakedown, Chaddesley Corbett, Harvington or Wolverley which would provide the opportunity for improved, sustainable facilities and services for those villages. I support development of a new community on the Lea Castle Hospital and School brownfield site, provided 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> <p>Crown House on the Bull Ring in Kidderminster and the timber yard on Park Lane</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				are significant examples of brownfield sites which should be in the Local Plan. Should the land owner not be amenable to housing development then I urge the use of Compulsory Purchase Orders. The Council must make more effort in identifying suitable brownfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO4229</a>	Alternatives	Comment	IF YOU HAVE TO BUILD THEN LEA CASTLE SHOULD BE BUILT ON AS IT HAS BEEN BUILT ON PREVIOUSLY .
	<a href="#">LPPO4806</a>	Alternatives	Comment	The Preferred Options Document shows a small part of the golf course between Kidderminster and Stourport (formerly Wyre Forest GC and Birchen Coppice GC) for house building. Surely the whole of the golf course should be used as I understand it is in liquidation, has land owned by WFDC, is unsuitable for agriculture, is not in the Green Belt and is not an essential leisure facility, as there are an abundance of golf clubs in and around Wyre Forest all looking for new members. The area is vast (about the size of Spennells) and could accommodate a separation zone between residents at its Stourport boundary.
	<a href="#">LPPO4807</a>	Alternatives	Comment	There are areas to the north of Kidderminster not considered in the options document, because of the fixation for an eastern relief road. An example that should have been considered is at Habberley where the community is shielded with a road and verges.
	<a href="#">LPPO4384</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Could the area of Lea Castle included in Option B not also be included in Option A?
	<a href="#">LPPO3549</a>	Alternatives	Comment	There are sufficient current and future sites on brownfield land, (lea castle, Kidderminster Town Centre and outer areas) To be used first. I would like to see regeneration in Kidderminster Town Centre bringing communities into the Town.
	<a href="#">LPPO3479</a>	Lea Castle	Support	The Lea Castle Hospital site should be enlarged to develop a larger and more sustainable housing.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>It would also enable the development of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A two form school</li> <li>2. Doctors surgery</li> <li>3. Bus Service to and from Kidderminster</li> <li>4. Local Shops</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3343</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Must use existing brownfield sites in Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO3388</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Housing can be built on brownfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO3976</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Object	<p>I would suggest as an alternative to building around Offmore &amp; Comberton, a bigger site at Lea Castle. The Plan currently proposes using some of this land in both Option A and B but I would suggest combining the land under both options and then extending the site to include land up to the Wolverhampton Road and at the rear of Lea Castle up to Axborough Lane. There might also be a possibility of further development on the western side of Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill, which would link with development at the Sion Hill School site. With this proposed land, including the sites in that vicinity already included in the Plan, a sustainable community of around 2,000-2,500 houses could be created. This would be large enough to support a 2 form entry primary school within the catchment of Wolverley High School (thus positively impacting on the school's long term viability) and a sustainable bus service. It would also support a 'village' centre within the Cookley Parish without putting a burden on that community and would potentially be able to support live-work units.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4628</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	Kidderminster town centre is in desperate need of regeneration and perhaps using land closer to the town centre will help invigorate it and mean that we don't just

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				have charity shops and empty shops.
	<a href="#">LPPO3662</a>	Selba Drive	Object	As a resident of more than 20 years I am fully aware of how frequently this amenity land is used by residents of the whole estate from children playing football, dog walkers, parents with very small children to safely run around and many other recreational pursuits. The only other area on Habberley Estate is the play area behind Habberley Club which is not big enough or suitable for any of these activities. All other land around this area is privately owned and not accessible by right to the public.
	<a href="#">LPPO4061</a>	Alternatives	Object	<p>Bewdley can contribute to additional housing needs not by building on identified greenfield sites but by amongst other things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conversion of workhouse in High Street and derelict underused neighbouring land near the R.C.Church into flats</li> <li>• Imaginative use of the Dog lane site not just for parking but small scale housing in keeping with existing Dog Lane historic cottages and possibly some small business premises etc.</li> <li>• Wholesale redevelopment of Bridge house/surrounding Rowing Club site in Wribbenhall and adjoining camping site to maintain some business/sport related capacity but also to create significant additional housing - hopefully more in keeping with and enhancing older existing housing along this part of the river .</li> <li>• Renovation/conversion of empty retail properties into flats e.g former HSBC site</li> <li>• Renovation of Ribbesford House</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4075</a>	Selba Drive	Object	Regarding the “Local Plan Review” in connection with the suggested proposal to build community housing on land adjacent to Selba Drive in Kidderminster.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>I wish to register my “<b>Strongest Objection</b>” to the proposal to use the land adjacent to Selba Drive for community housing for the following reasons.</p> <p>This area is frequented on a daily basis by children of all ages as it is a safe play area. This allows them to be involved in many different types of sports, games and other recreational pursuits. Safety is enhanced by the absence of any through traffic and infrequent vehicle movements in the Cul-de-Sac.</p> <p>The area is also regularly used by many adults for dog walking and exercising activities. In particular local residents acknowledge it as a place of peacefulness and somewhere to meet friends and relax.</p> <p>Habberley Estate has little or no identified play areas that are easily and safely accessible by children and parents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4082</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>Suggested proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having looked at the proposal for the development of the Lea Castle site would it not be better to enlarge this development up to the A449 and Axborough Lane. This would then allow for a development along with the Hurcott ADR and any other additional parcels of land within the surrounding area (west of A449) a sustainable community of some 2000 homes which could be afforded its own ‘village centre’ thereby not impacting on Cookley. The A449 is a major trunk road that could easily accommodate any additional traffic with no on route villages to be affected.</li> <li>• This development would be significant enough to support its own primary school and with Wolverley CE High school on its doorstep answer the education development requirements.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>The Horsefair 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 in. This is an area that should be fully reviewed and with careful planning could be a super development for both housing and leisure and a be a gateway into the heart of town rather than the eyesore it is now. Although it will not be too long before it can be developed if the collapsing of the old Post Office building is anything to go by.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4595</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>It appears from the press the Lion Fields is due to be offered for development of cafes, restaurants, leisure and cinema. This will introduce yet another 'centre' to Kidderminster. The town needs to be consolidated not made even more sprawling; we already have three centres, Weavers Wharf, Swan Centre (which appears to be dying on its feet along with Worcester Street) and the Rowland Hill Centre. Why can this large Brownfield site not be used for housing, which would effectively bring more people and life into the town centre.</p> <p>There are various derelict/empty Brownfield sites around the District. Where owners are not willing to 'offer these up for housing' why can't the Council issue Compulsory Purchase Orders on these sites, in order to protect our precious Green Belt?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4599</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Has anyone considered that to the north of Kidderminster there is an area which is between Habberley, Franche, Fairfield and Wolverley that has a lot of open land, little of it actively farmed and what looks like some brownfield areas. This area is serviced by the Bridgnorth Road (A442) with the B4189 giving direct access to Wolverhampton Road (A449) and Stourbridge Road (A451). I do not know whether these areas are Green Belt or not but I am aware that Wolverley School is short of pupils for the future, so in some ways these needs could be matched by some new houses locally.</p> <p>The Ferndale Estate built at the north of Franche, has the ability to cope with more</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>houses, with access roads already in place. Could this be considered for a larger community with many existing facilities available locally on the Franche Road nearby with direct access to the town, factories and Bewdley.</p> <p>There is an obvious choice for at Lea Castle Hospital, which is effectively brownfield. There are plans to build 600 houses. Surely if the whole site i.e the triangle of land from A449 -B4189 -A451 and topped off at Axborough Lane was used this would give a village community, that not only could it gain its own facilities, school, shops, Doctors and bus's etc., but would help nearby Cookley with its lack of Primary School places and top up Wolverley's shortage of older pupils.</p> <p>I gather that Sion Hill School site has now been sold to developers, so why not use the small parcel of land south of the B4189 in Broadwaters next to the A449 and make a worthwhile job of building houses in this area, which already has some level of facilities which would be available from day one.</p> <p>The centre of Kidderminster Town has so many possibilities for improvement that if we made an effort, the vibrancy would again return to what used to be a destination for shopping and entertainment.</p> <p>Worcester Street area is waiting to happen .....completely rebuild all the shop fronts and above build back and fill with modern apartments for people to live in and enjoy the town, with access and parking from the rear in Bromsgrove Street. The proposed new cinema and eating establishment with parking is a great idea but some parking area needs to be kept for shoppers.</p> <p>At the Eastern end of Worcester Street there are buildings being left to deteriorate. Park Lane in town has old buildings and a canal, all around the country these areas are sought after to build new or converted apartments for modern</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>life.</p> <p>Green Street opposite Aldi there is another old building that lies empty waiting for a refurb. Maybe this could possibly be more apartments close to local amenities. Or a mini version of SALTS MILL which is located in Saltaire on the outskirts of Bradford. Crown House. Developers love to build on open land and don't want to get involved in what can be expensive and difficult work, surely this is a chance for one of them to shine.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4600</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Further building of houses to the Lea Castle Hospital site under Option B. We believe that this site could accommodate at least two thousand five hundred houses. The result of this would be a more 'sustainable village' environment with the following advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be within the catchment of Wolverley High school and would positively impact on the school's long term viability.</li> <li>• Would be large enough to support a two-form entry primary school.</li> <li>• Would support a village centre whilst not encroaching on the Cookley Parish.</li> <li>• Would be capable of sustaining a bus service.</li> <li>• Would potentially be able to provide live-work units.</li> </ul> <p>In addition it is wrong of WFDC to not consider development on the north/west of Kidderminster. One to two hundred houses could be developed to the rear of the existing Ferndale estate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4602</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>I appreciate the need to increase the number of houses in the Wyre Forest but would suggest there are more suitable sites, with greater opportunities, local community services; employment etc...in closer proximity such as the Burlish Park Golf Course that has recently closed, or the development of the sites in</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				Kidderminster Town Centre of the old Glades Leisure Centre and/ or Woolworths. And in Stourport there is again the site of the old Leisure Centre that has yet to be sold/redeveloped.
	<a href="#">LPPO4606</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>Lea Castle has been out of use since 2008 and is now a derelict site. I would welcome the redevelopment of the site to its own community as it previously was. Building on existing footprints alone, would not provide a community as these are spread distances apart across a huge site. Far more than 600 houses could be built. Extend this site up to the Wolverhampton Road, Axborough Lane and the Stourbridge Road and look at the option of developing the western side of Wolverley Road incorporating Site Hill site. This would mean that there would be enough houses for it to be a sustainable community which would be able to have its own primary school, shop etc, thus reducing pressure placed on existing services which are already at full capacity. This school could then feed into Wolverley High School and Baxter College which are able to accommodate additional students. The road structure is already in place to facilitate the development of this community and would be capable of sustaining a bus service. Live/work units could be included in these plans.</p> <p>Further develop behind the Ferndale estate to spread the development across Kidderminster.</p> <p>Instead of industrial units by Hodgehill nurseries, use existing sites such as Greenhill Industrial Estate, Hartlebury Trading Estate, Hoobrook etc where there are empty units and would be preferable to fill those first before building on Green Belt land.</p> <p>I strongly believe the above suggestions are a far more positive way forward, limiting the impact on local residents and existing services.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4508</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	The obvious choice for your 1st phase would be Lea Castle and that area around Wolverley X roads/A449 as you already have good land available and the added use of a vacant school at Sion Hill.
	<a href="#">LPPO4522</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Object	A larger development of the Lea Castle site as suggested by OCAG-LP would seem to merit serious consideration.
	<a href="#">LPPO3155</a>	6.57	Object	As an alternative I would like to see a rejuvenation of town centre brown belt land for proposed housing development. The town, and areas close by, have much land that could be used to provide the housing growth demanded by the Government and also drastically improve the aesthetics of what is at the moment a very run down and derelict space.
	<a href="#">LPPO4645</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Put all 3000 dwellings on existing brownfield sites</li> <li>- Expand Lea Castle</li> <li>- Encourage division of barn conversions into smaller units.</li> <li>- Regenerate the town centre with affordable housing in empty buildings</li> <li>- Inc numbers of houses on Sion Hill school site</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO1925</a>	Lea Castle Hospital Extesnion	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports extended Lea Castle site.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3044</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>The Woolworths and Littlewoods sites in Worcester Street should be purchased, compulsorily if necessary, to facilitate the building of a leisure complex in the existing town centre in order to help to rejuvenate the town centre, with multi-storey parking incorporated into the development. This would then free up the entire Lionfields site for residential development, including the old Victorian Market building which could be converted into in-town apartments, with local town shopping and railway access conveniently alongside.</p> <p>An alternative development would be for the Lea Castle Hospital site to be</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				developed as a self-contained, out of town residential village site, initially on brownfield land and only if necessary, extending into Green Belt land within the third 5-year phase.
	<a href="#">LPPO3071</a>	Suggestion for Town Centre and Lea Castle	Comment	<p>I also feel there are plenty of other sites which could be used like for instance lea castle, sion Hill school.</p> <p>What about building apartments in the town centre where all the empty shops are.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2996</a>	Alternatives	Object	<p>As already identified it is good to read about the development of brownfield sites for residential dwellings; the District and especially Kidderminster town centre has declined and so utilising some of these buildings and converting them for affordable living will bring people back into the centre of town to utilise the town amenities and within walking distance use the added new attractions and eateries that the town has accommodated in central locations such as the alongside the River Stour. This should mirror the success that Worcester has achieved through their regeneration and riverside location with places such as Diglis where homes are affordable to buy and rent and are in the lower quartile of housing prices. Kidderminster and Stourport have their heritage to protect so revamping and converting industrial buildings would keep the integrity of the town and make the buildings both desirable and unique.</p> <p>The Lea Castle Hospital site is a site that should be developed and it was pleasing to hear the Conservative MP Mark Garnier agree with our vision to use this site. This area could be an ideal location to house a new village to support Cookley and Wolverley, I also believe the site could house more than the proposed 600 homes as seen in the plan. This location is also near good A roads and links to Birmingham through the A451, A456 and the A449 for those that are commuting to</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Birmingham and other local West Midland locations.</p> <p><b>Blakedown- Travel and Railway Links</b></p> <p>Another consideration is our travel and Railway links, why is Blakedown not considered for development? You state that Kidderminster Railway station is the 2<sup>nd</sup> busiest in Worcestershire, it requires improvement especially for parking and the projection of greater passengers in the future but Blakedown is a station that could be developed and also on the line to Birmingham. You state in your report that Blakedown and Cookley have reasonable public transport but Blakedown we could make much better use of. If we are to develop the Lea Castle Hospital Site it would be vital to develop Blakedown too to accommodate the numbers which would use the rail network to access local commuter towns and cities. You must consider the local needs for Blakedown, and the boosting factor that this growing village has a railway station for the local residents as this would help to disperse the numbers and demand that is currently placed on the Kidderminster town station. Blakedown needs to be suitable developed, it should not be omitted or overlooked from your plans.</p>
Offmore Comberton Action Group - Local Plans	<a href="#">LPPO1566</a>	Additional Site - Lea Castle	Comment	<p>The current draft WFDC Proposals in Options A and B propose using some of the land at Lea Castle. We propose extending this by including not only Options A and B but also extending the site to use the land up to the Wolverhampton Rd and, at the rear of the Lea Castle site, extending the site up to Axborough Lane as well as across to the Stourbridge Rd.</p> <p>We believe that an additional 37.73 Hectares can be brought into the Lea Castle site in this way. • We further believe that there MIGHT be a possibility of some development on the western side of Wolverley Rd towards Sion Hill to link with development at the Sion Hill Middle School site.</p> <p>With the additional land and including sites in that vicinity already identified by</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>WFDC, we believe a sustainable community of around 2,000-2,500 houses could be created. This would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be large enough to support a 2 form entry Primary School.</li> <li>• support a village shopping centre and potentially some employment land.</li> <li>• support a village centre which whilst within Cookley Parish would not produce a burden on that community.</li> <li>• be capable of sustaining a bus service.</li> <li>• potentially be able to provide live-work units.</li> <li>• be within the catchment of Wolverley CE High School and would positively impact on the school's long term viability.</li> </ul> <p>We believe that our alternatives will create viable and sustainable communities, protect valuable, productive farmland, preserve endangered bird species and other wildlife and, by prioritising Brownfield development, ensure that our towns and town centres are viable and thriving.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1868</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	I think Option A Lea Castle "Sustainable Village" would be suitable for the building of houses. A two form entry primary school and a bus service.
	<a href="#">LPPO2089</a>	Extended Lea Castle and Ferndale	Support	We support Lea Castle sustainable village with 2 form entry primary school and village centre sustainable bus service. Live-work units.
Spennells Against Further Expansion	<a href="#">LPPO1740</a>	6.57 - site / strategysuggestion	Comment	<p><u>Phase 1 (first 5 years):</u> Use existing empty properties in the town centre e.g. Woolworths site for a leisure complex (cinema/bowling alley) and ideally the adjacent ex-Littlewoods building for a multi-storey car park. The remaining Lionfields site could then all be dedicated to housing/residential; plus other brownfield sites such as the Churchfields site (3000 houses could be constructed on these sites). If Worcester Street was not returned to through traffic, the Council would immediately save £500,000 of taxpayers moneyto purchase the vacant</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Woolworths building.</p> <p><u>Phase 2 (5-10 years)</u> : Use Lea Castle hospital site (brownfield site) for 600-700 houses.</p> <p><u>Phase 3 (after reviewing housing need, 10 – 15 years)</u>: Lea Castle Hospital and School site - use of Green Belt extension if absolutely necessary. Green Belt at Lea Castle only released at this stage if deemed necessary for increased housing.</p> <p><b>No Green Belt site to be released until housing needs are reviewed after 10 years.</b></p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3254</a>	Lea Castle	Support	<p>A far more sensible proposal would be to build on the whole of the Lea Castle site as I appreciate houses need to be built somewhere in the area. Building on that site would not interfere with the local community or cause excessive traffic in an already built up area. Wolverley high school is not over subscribed so would have spaces for the new community. This would also support their long term viability.</p> <p>I would urge the council to think about these arguments rather than rushing into easy options that end up causing long term problems.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3854</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>Looks to far ahead. Silverwoods needs finishing with appropriate infrastructure, recreational and green areas. Brownfield sites should be used for building rather than greenfield, such as Stanklyn Lane.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4681</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>would like to suggest that another review is done to check your housing figures needed. Then a further review needs to take place to check the <i>now</i> available brownfield sites to build on. New sites have come vacant since your plan, some of considerable size such as the land next to Matalan (ex-Wood Yard), possible further land at Victoria Carpets, and land at Kidderminster Harriers.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are also very many empty factories and buildings in and around Kidderminster town centre and ring road. The Magistrates Court being a prime example of this. All of these should be used first to build apartments for our younger or elderly population near the town centre and amenities (thus freeing up more ‘family’ sized homes negating the need to build more of these), and if these long standing empty buildings were not put forward in the Call for Sites, compulsory purchase orders should be used to acquire such.</li> <li>• The proposed ‘new cinema’ on Lionfields should be located elsewhere. If the Debenhams building becomes vacant or one of the large units over by Sainsbury’s, this should be utilised first. Lionfields is a prime location for residential development, thus being able to breathe life back into Worcester Street with an array of attractive cafes, restaurants, gyms and bespoke shops. The larger buildings (Woolworths e.g.) could be used for such cinema or a bowling alley itself. The amount of trendy ‘urban’ living apartments would encourage young people to stay in Kidderminster, and also give elderly people the chance to live somewhere safe and with facilities and release larger homes for families in existing suburbs. The money saved on not opening Worcester Street back up to traffic, could be used to regenerate this area as the night life / social eating area of Kidderminster. The current REEL cinema would become vacant if the new cinema is built, thus creating further opportunity to convert to apartments, or reduce the need for further industrial units at Easter Park.</li> <li>• Another option is to expand the development of Lea Castle and make it a village in its own right (develop from both options A and B). This should be developed in its entirety with local shops/facilities and a good road network, this supporting the Cookley and surrounding residents in getting to Birmingham and relieving the much maligned Horsefair and Ring Road.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4647</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	Kidderminster town centre has a lot of scope for development. You have Crown House, the swimming baths and the old Law Courts immediately spring to mind. It may even put some life into the town which at the moment is sadly lacking. I note there are brownfield sites that have not even been mentioned eg Brown Westhead. I would be very interested (along with a large number of people) to know the reasoning behind not developing these 'hidden' brownfield sites.
	<a href="#">LPPO3400</a>	Alternatives	Comment	I would also prefer WFDC to look at revitalising the town centre by including as much housing as possible in new developments in the centre by combining it with retail and leisure i.e. shops/cafes on the ground level with flats/apartments above. A number of premises which have been empty for a considerable time would benefit the town by an imaginative conversion into housing including housing as part of the development of the Glades Leisure Centre site, and making provision for housing combined with new retail units along an improved road lay-out along that part of Blackwell Street leading to the Horsefair would be of great benefit to a gateway into the town. The old Victoria Carpets sports ground on Spennells Valley Road may be worth looking at also, as would the defunct golf course between Kidderminster and Stourport.
	<a href="#">LPPO4393</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	Empty units in the town could become apartments, industrial estates with empty units could be redeveloped. Plenty of areas where building would not upset so many lives like on Spennells.
	<a href="#">LPPO3666</a>	Alternative sites	Support	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Blakedown to share some of the development. As you suggest this has a rail link and school. You have not included Blakedown in your plans. Why is this? It has a road link, good rail way and access and school.</li> <li>2. Increases to housing near to the Safari Park,</li> <li>3. Increases to housing towards the west of Kidderminster – in Franche and Woverley, distribute the housing rather than all on one site which will create an urban sprawl.</li> <li>4. In old Sion Hill school</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. At the back of Morrisons</li> <li>6. The old Woolworth site and to the rear.</li> <li>7. Place permanent housing on the large caravan sites in Stourport.</li> <li>8. Use The town centre – build apartments in areas where the town is no longer vibrant. This will make the town more vibrant and safe.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO3654</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>Clearly as WFDC have a target to meet of 300 new homes annually, until 2034. I appreciate that building new homes has to take place. To the east of Kidderminster we have the Lea Castle site which should surely be a primary development location. I would like to make the following observations in favour of the development of the Lea Castle Site.</p> <p>Options A and B WFDC current draft proposes using <u>some</u> of Lea Castle land for development. (Development plans for 600 homes were displayed at St Oswald’s Church Hall on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2016mber 2016) If the whole of the Lea Castle site were included in this proposed development then a new sustainable village, like Cookley, could be created. I also understand that with over 1000 dwellings a first school and shops become a viable option for a “Lea Castle Village”. Advantages of the Lea Castle site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With a sustainable community of say 1500 homes this could become a new Village with shops and a two form entry Primary School.</li> <li>• It could support a village centre which, despite being in the parish of Cookley, would be a separate village.</li> <li>• It would have existing road links to Kidderminster, Stourbridge, Wolverhampton and beyond.</li> <li>• It would be capable of sustaining a bus service</li> <li>• It would be within the catchment of Wolverley CE High School which</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				would have a positive impact on the school's long term viability
	<a href="#">LPPO3964</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Object	<p>New Road is full of shops that could be relocated (perhaps some to the vacant shops within the town centre and vacant units on the Stourport Road) and housing built on both sides of the road. This would provide housing that is near the town centre, railway station and canal.</p> <p>I also think lots of care should be taken to provide quality, free, places to go. Sanders Park in Bromsgrove is much nicer than any park in Kidderminster and could be used as a model for Spennells Park.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3354</a>	6.57	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Employment that could be within the South Kidderminster Enterprise Zone: 'Adjacent Ceramaspeed', 'Victoria Carpets Sports Ground' and land between Hoo Farm &amp; Summerfield and opposite Easter Park.</li> <li>- Core Housing Sites that could replace Option A to the South of Kidderminster: 'Timber Yard Park Lane' and 'Bromsgrove St' (excluding the Glades site).</li> <li>- Create a large housing estate on the 'Lea Castle Hospital' site that has its own shops and services.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3295</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Land at Yew Tree Walk, Stourport is brownfield - this should be given precedence to greenfield land. The land is near to the town centre and immediately available.
	<a href="#">LPPO4456</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Large buildings in Kidderminster town centre lay empty ready to develop.
	<a href="#">LPPO4526</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	I support the development of the vast Lea Castle site which has been idle far too long. This site is perfect for a sustainable community. Advantages it is large enough to support a 2 form entry Primary School - it is in the catchment area of Wolverley High School. It is capable of sustaining a bus service. This is a compact area and would easily become a community heart - not like the straggled Eastern

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>By Pass proposal.</p> <p>WFDC DO NOT MAKE A DISASTEROUS MAJOR PLANNING DECISION - LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE - LEA CASTLE IS THE OBVIOUS SITE TO DEVELOP WITH THE LEAST ENCROACHMENT ON GREEN BELT.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4672</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Justification 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4541</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>We feel that the proposed development at Lea Castle is the answer to your apparent need of more housing and could be further maximised without impacting on Green Belt land. There is sufficient land to encompass this and there is already infrastructure on site to accommodate a larger building project than proposed. This would seem more like a little village, better than a strip of land stretched into Green Belt at Offmore with a lack of community heart. The local schools are under subscribed, Wolverley CE High School being one, whereas Offmore Schools are over subscribed and can't be extended. Wouldn't a small primary school also on the Lea Castle site then become necessary for the extra houses and an answer to the locals needs anyway. A larger development at Lea Castle would also affect less householders directly than on the proposed East Offmore development.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				The roads that surround the Lea Castle Site are already in place and further roads for the extra traffic wouldn't then be necessary, money saved. This money could be better spent then than on new bridges, new infrastructure and new roads to allow then possibly to help improve areas like Comberton and the Horsefair.
	<a href="#">LPPO4159</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Build on brownfield sites in Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO4711</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	There are other options for housing the older inhabitants and younger people. Kidderminster has not made adequate efforts to make use of inner city land, especially in the more central areas, where most of the services are located. Canal side locations have been successfully developed in other towns and cities and the canal opposite Weavers Wharf would lend itself to the development of flats and apartments close to services. At the moment the huge timber yard and other semi-industrial uses will not attract shoppers to our retail district. Also the old shopping area, now declining could be rezoned for residential use. As our population is static, but the number of individual households is increasing, smaller developments close to facilities might be the answer. This is especially important for the more elderly residents who would not wish to be physically isolated in a vast housing development.
	<a href="#">LPPO4733</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p><b>6.57</b> What alternative option would I suggest? I would suggest a pragmatic approach to the requirement to build more dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start the Plan by completing the proposed housing on Silverwoods site (70 dwellings) and the other brownfield sites around the Wyre Forest (783 dwellings) in accordance with Policy 30 Table 30.0.1on page 173. Total <b>853</b></li> <li>• There are dwellings already being constructed. From the figures supplied by WFDC these will number <b>441</b> during 2016. There may be more by the time we get to the end of 2017.</li> <li>• Most residents I have spoken to at the consultation meetings agree that</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>the Lea Castle Hospital site would be a suitable area to put a large scale development. The core site would provide 600 dwellings. If this is then combined with the 2 sites from option A (150 dwellings) and option B (360). this would give a total of <b>1110</b>. There used to be a school on the Lea Castle site (Alexander Patterson School). I don't know if the building is still there but, if so it could be refurbished and bought back into use. This would follow the view expressed in the Plan to minimise the number of sites in a more concentrated strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Sion Hill School site is close enough to Lea Castle to consider using the land for a school rather than 60 dwellings. The shortfall could be taken up by encouraging larger existing houses to be converted to flats (Policy 18D) or old factories down Green street or elsewhere to be developed into flats.</li> <li>• This could take us at least 10/12 years into the future to get these dwellings built or at least agreed. At this time the plan could be reviewed in the light of the changed requirements at this time which may or may not require the need to develop on greenfield sites. I know people who have houses on the Spennells estate. They have been advised when purchasing the property that there are in place plans to build on land on the edge of this estate. Presumably, this land already designated could be used for more dwelling if required.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4770</a>	6.57 Alternative Sites	Comment	<p>The following are either brownfield, empty or vacant properties that should be developed before any Green Belt land is used thus creating a mixture of low cost starter houses, inner city living apartments and canal side properties which would bring people and life back into the centre of Kidderminster, will support shops, coffee shops, restaurants, pubs and in turn create a vibrant town centre without building on Green Belt.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lea Castle – Potential for 1000 houses which would also then be eligible for a new school. If the planned number of house on this site increases then a new school could be accommodated here to avoid further congestion, it is well screened from major roads which would also add to the look of the area.</li> <li>• Sion Hill (School) now derelict and in need of demolition</li> <li>• Timber yard (opposite Weaver’s Wharf)</li> <li>• Empty buildings (by Matalan)</li> <li>• Wyre Forest Golf Club site (owned by the council) now unused.</li> <li>• Crown House – develop into flats for inner city living or demolish</li> <li>• The old Magistrates Building could provide refurbished apartments</li> </ul> <p>I understand there are currently over 1000 empty residential properties around Wyre Forest, these need to be utilised before any building work on new homes begins.</p> <p>Outlying areas such as Stourport, Bewdley, Wolverley, Chaddesley Corbett, Blakedown, Mustow Green etc appeared to have been left out or hugely overlooked in this review.</p> <p>In addition any land lords with empty properties should be made to put these back into the housing stock either for rent or for sale. We cannot have properties sitting empty whilst we use up Green Belt land. The Council should also lobby Parliament to change any laws to ensure landowners do not keep empty properties which are detrimental to the local area e.g. Crown House and Worcester Street.</p> <p>Further to this we may have land in the area which is owned by developers who are not building due I expect due to the lack of profit available. Any planning permission already granted to such developers need to develop these sites without delay, any future planning permission given should have a time period</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				that states any building work is started & completed within that time scale.
	<a href="#">LPPO4747</a>	6.57 Alternative Sites	Comment	Lea Castle could accommodate 1000 houses as the infrastructure is already in place, by increasing the planned number of houses on this site a school could be accommodated here to avoid further congestion.
	<a href="#">LPPO4543</a>	6.57	Comment	I would request also that other brownfield sites within the parish of Cookley and Wolverley are also considered i.e. Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley which was a former army hospital in WW2.
	<a href="#">LPPO3426</a>	Brownfield Sites	Comment	I urge the Council to re-consider brownfield sites such as space left by Glades and Lea Castle. Developing our pitiful town centre would help to regenerate this area. The town definitely does not need any more supermarkets.
	<a href="#">LPPO3853</a>	6.57	Comment	Develop all the small plots of land that has already had buildings on previously.  The old Sladen school site, Sion Hill Middle school site the Glades on Bromsgrove Street site instead of taking what seems to be the easy option of churning up large swathes of virgin Green Belt land.  A village at Lea Castle has been suggested which would be large enough to support economic advantages to schools/education and infrastructure in the immediate community.
	<a href="#">LPPO4608</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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.  I also strongly suggest that you consider other brownfield sites such as those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				and Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO4613</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	I understand the need for more houses in Britain, but I fully believe that these houses have to be built with sustainability in mind. If you are looking to encourage people to move to Kidderminster and invest in the local area, you need to provide these residents with services, such as schools and public transport. This would all be possible with extending the planned building on the Lea Castle site. Developing a sustainable village would allow for a school to be built, a bus service and a village centre. This would be much more desirable. To me, it is clear that building a village on Lea Castle is the only option that is viable and sustainable.
	<a href="#">LPPO4614</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	The Lea Castle ‘Sustainable Village’ plan as put forward by ‘Offmore Comberton Action Group-Local Plans’ should be taken up. This proposal is futuristic, a new community which many people would love to live in, not dollops of development strung out across the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO4663</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>I 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> <p>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.” I would counter that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				not built on behind The Range at Crossley Park in Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO4524</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>There are many empty and unused sites: The old Magistrates Courts and other empty units in Worcester Street; Park Lane factory buildings - empty and decaying; Mill Street seems to have numerous unused and empty sites; Crown House; Easter Park still has empty units - perhaps a change of land use should be considered here since, after seven years we still do not need so many retail units there.</p> <p>There is still a long way to go with the new development at the former British Sugar site - why can't we hold off on any drastic commitment until we see a clear need?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4531</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>Are you sure there are no more brownfield sites that could be utilized. Let's start by pulling down Crown House and replacing it with a residential property. Are there no buildings in New Road and Green Street that are not being used but could be converted into homes.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4016</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Object	<p>I note that the current local plans propose using some land at Lea Castle to help meet housing allocation targets. Consideration should be given to not only including Options A &amp; B but also extending the site to sue land up to Wolverhampton Road and extending the site up to Axborough Lane. The additional land at these sites could create a sustainable community of 2,000-2,500 houses and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be large enough to support a 2 form entry primary school</li> <li>• also support a village centre, but not put a burden on that community</li> <li>• capable of sustaining a bus service</li> <li>• offer scope for live-work units</li> <li>• and be in the catchment of Wolverley High School- positively impacting on</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>its long term viability</p> <p>I'm concerned that no consideration has been given to looking at meeting some of housing allocation targets by developing out on land to the North/West of Kidderminster. For example some new stock could be reasonably developed near the Ferndale estate.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4028</a>	Alternatives	Support	<p>A possible alternative is to start using brown sites to build on such as Sion Hill middle school and derelict buildings inside the town such as the old Woolworths and many more buildings down Worcester Street. Other weaknesses of Kidderminster that could be worked on includes the stretched GP services, few major high value employers and Kidderminster town centre, none of which will be achieved through increasing the population.</p> <p>The plan in option A mention building 600 hundred houses, on the old Lea Castle site, would it more viable to build more houses in this area as well as a school and shops, not only would this be a beautiful place to live you will be generating more jobs.</p> <p>The plan also hasn't considered other surrounding areas such as Blakedown which would be much more viable for access to Birmingham.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4881</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Support	<p>Transferring the Option A Lea Castle extension land, to Option B</p> <p>Your plan also makes no reference to the possibility of using the extensive land surrounding Blakedown. This would be an important consideration, as here, there is scope to extend car parking at Blakedown train station.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4874</a>	6.57 Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>Providing the stops are in place on Hurcott Lane and Hurcott Road full development of the Lea Castle site, which I understand could provide up to 2000 dwellings, seems the most logical step to develop the eastern side of</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				Kidderminster, if that is deemed necessary, despite there being availability of land in other areas. If Lea Castle were developed to its full potential there would be cost savings on infrastructure and in particular utilities. It would also offer the ability to offer a mix of affordable housing far in excess of that which would be provided on the Hurcott sites. Additionally it would be self sufficient in terms of local amenities, schooling and medical facilities, which would then not be a drain on overstretched Cookley.
	<a href="#">LPPO4457</a>	6.57	Comment	We urge the government to build on the brownfield sites within Kidderminster which will regenerate the town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO4226</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Redevelop the old post office and derelict factory buildings in Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO4300</a>	Alternatives	Comment	I would also like to suggest the use of the Kidderminster golf course as part of the re-development plans. The golf course could be re-located in some of the proposed building area and hence maintain the precious Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO3805</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Support	I suggest that the tower above the old post office at the Bull Ring Kidderminster is converted into affordable apartments clad in non-combustible material to improve aesthetics.
	<a href="#">LPPO3143</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Under Planning Policy Statement 3 for housing priority for development should be previously developed land, in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings. This area of land has only a small footprint of buildings. Other areas with more previous development in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings would be more suitable. Without development previously used land has a detrimental affect on area.
	<a href="#">LPPO4511</a>	6.57 - Extended Lea Castle	Support	As an alternative, I'm throwing my weight behind the Lea Castle "Sustainable Village" plan outlined by the OCAG-LP. The current draft WFDC Proposals in Options A and B propose using some of the land at Lea Castle. I propose extending

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>this by including not only Options A and B, but also extending the site to use the land up to the Wolverhampton road and at the rear of the Lea Castle site, extending the site up to Axborough Lane. I also believe that there might be a possibility of some development on the western side of Wolverly Rd towards Sion Hill to link with development at the Sion Hill Middle School site.</p> <p>This plan would be large enough to support a new 2 form entry Primary school, a new village centre, a sustainable bus service and would also be in the catchment area of Wolverley High School. And that’s only scratching the surface.</p> <p>Please at least seriously consider this alternative plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4548</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>It would be far preferable to create a sustainable village at the Lea Castle site. Extend the site up to Wolverhampton Road and to Axborough Lane. Include the required primary school and a village centre to minimise impact on Cookley. It would be in the Wolverley High School catchment.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3643</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	<p>I would like to suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lea Castle blue print only.</li> <li>• Westhead park Wolverley</li> <li>• Site of the old Quarry.</li> </ul> <p>Plus we have a town centre sitting empty, why not turn he empty shops, disused offices into dwellings, thus surrounding the new eateries, making Kidderminster a more attractive enticing place to live and socialise.</p> <p>I also believe that our area needs to be more innovative in our buildings and become a known area for a sustainable district of innovative non traditional building method. We started off right with the council building why not for all</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>future homes and business development more fitting to our landscape, after all Wyre Forest is known for its Oak trees and we have vast farming for straw/hay for strawbale.</p> <p>This alone would bring in visitors to our area and make people want to migrate.</p> <p>I hope we can all work together closely to make the Wyre Forest an area we can all be proud of for future generations.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3334</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>There are brownfield and infill sites available that have not been considered/identified, these need to be used before any development on greenfield sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3120</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	<p>Bromsgrove St. (BHS/2): I do not feel that Kidderminster needs another cinema with a multi-storey or more shops. This would release more land for housing. Perhaps some of the empty shops in the town could be converted into housing thus bringing life back into Worcester Street.</p> <p>Sion Hill School (WFR/WC/18): Develop the playing fields and extend this development down to the Wolverhampton Road.</p> <p>Lea Castle (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 and extending the site up to Axborough Lane. This is my preferred option as it would create a sustainable community with its own Primary School, health facilities, shops etc. This larger community would alleviate any issues that a smaller site would have on Cookley Parish.</p> <p>There are no proposals for any development on the north/west of Kidderminster e.g. The rear of Ferndale Estate could be developed.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3327</a>	6.57 Alternative Sites	Support	<p>An alternative would be to develop brownfield sites and Kidderminster Golf club, potentially widening Deansford Lane.</p> <p>Using the Lea Castle Centre would offer a centred separate community for new housing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3107</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>Alternative proposals to be considered:</p> <p>Increase Lea Castle land up to the Wolverhampton Rd, Axborough Lane and the Stourbridge Rd. Also on the western side of Wolverley Rd linking to the Sion Hill Middle School site. to create a sustainable community with new primary school and shops and the capacity to sustain a bus service. As a feeder school to Wovlerley CE High School it will also have a positive impact on the high schools long term future.</p> <p>Proposal of industrial development at Hodge Hill other empty units at industrial sites not being filled so need no further development.</p> <p>I hope these alternative proposals can be taken into consideration</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4041</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	<p><b><u>My proposals</u></b></p> <p>I believe the number of properties required in the Wyre Forest from 2019 to 2034 has been vastly over-estimated by both the Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN) by AMION and the Local Plan Review ( the Wyre Forest housing requirements has only grown by 1000 in the last 15 years ) and I believe the housing requirements should be met in order as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify and bring back into use all vacant housing properties in Wyre Forest</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identify and develop housing on all vacant brownfield sites</li> <li>• use the land banked areas</li> <li>• review the Kidderminster Town centre plan to revitalise the centre of the town as follows:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ consider converting to living accommodation many of the empty smaller shops</li> <li>○ scrap the plans to build a cinema on the old leisure centre and build properties (flats and small houses on this area)</li> <li>○ convert the old Woolworths and if necessary the Littlewoods store into a cinema and bowling alley</li> <li>○ demolish the old Crown House building and redevelop this area as originally planned</li> <li>○ build an enclosed two-way escalator access from Worcester Street to the Bromsgrove Streetcar park to bring people into town</li> <li>○ consider making the Bromsgrove Streetcar park multi- storey with apartments on top. If not build on the "smaller areas" nearer Prospect Hill</li> <li>○ convert the old law courts to apartments</li> <li>○ is the old health centre now fully utilised now the new one has been built? If not part-demolish and build housing</li> <li>○ develop the area that was fire damaged on the corner of New Road and Bridge Street</li> </ul> </li> <li>• consider small scale developments in Wolverley</li> <li>• consider developments in Blakedown as the station is being upgraded and a bigger car park is being built Although they now have a neighbourhood Plan this was not in existence when this consultation started and should be ignored</li> <li>• develop Lea Castle for housing as per the Local Plan</li> </ul> <p>If it is found after developing all brownfield sites that further housing is still</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>required THEN and ONLY THEN extend Lea Castle to Axborough Lane to the east towards Stoubridge Road and the west towards the Wolverhampton Road and get the developers to contribute to new roundabouts on both roads. The roundabout on the Stoubridge Road will hopefully help to cut down the number of serious and fatal accidents on this stretch of road. This developed area in and around Lea Castle could then become a new village with it's own school, shops and health centre.</p> <p>This village could also be extended south of Park Gate Road if there was the need.</p> <p>If you still a requirement after this has all been completed the take up the remaining parts of option B as this is much more dispersed and requires less Green Belt than option A</p> <p>I believe there are enough suggestions in "My Proposals" above that would enable significant housing demands to be met in a priority which will not only be fair and satisfy most of the Wyre Forest population but will also bring life back into the town which Kidderminster desperately needs.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3746</a>	Selba Drive	Object	<p>The land was handed to the Council on the understanding that it would be left as open access land and green space for people to enjoy, not to be built on.</p> <p>It is well used by a great amount of people both young and old for many purposes and should remain as such.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4129</a>	6.57 extend Lea Castle	Comment	<p>As a first point we are surprised that the development of the largest brownfield site in the area, (the former Lea Castle complex) is subject to such a restricted plan whereas the major part of the plan is centred on Green Belt land. The complete development of this site would simply be a return it to being fully developed, albeit for a different purpose. The full development of this would directly</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>inconvenience by far the lowest number of existing house holders and due to the fact that most of the site is hidden from people travelling through the Wyre Forest area so the impact on the general attractiveness of the east of the town would not be impacted to such a great degree. We accept that the development of the land bordering the Stourbridge Road, between the Park Gate and Axborough, would be visible to travellers, but less than a dozen existing residents would be directly affected.</p> <p>The nature of the former use of this site means that the subterranean infrastructure is far greater than the footprint of the former buildings. This infrastructure and existing utilities on site, would also make development cheaper, quicker and inflict less disturbance on residents surrounding the site.</p> <p>There would also be the advantage of the development of a village atmosphere that would not be true of the ribbon development proposed. This site also provides existing access to major roads into and out of the ‘village’ that would not impact the locality so badly. It also completely eliminates the danger of providing a ‘cut through’ and provides a selfcontained safe village type community</p> <p>We are also surprised by the lack of utilisation of the Sion Hill school site. The explanation that it is to be retained for St Oswald’s school does not bear scrutiny. The former school playing field was far too large for the former secondary modern school. The adjoining fields leading down to the A449 would also increase the available building land by an extensive extent, again with little or no impact on the tiny number of local residents. This would also add to the village feel to the development, benefit existing schools and provide a local infrastructure of shops and community buildings. We submit that this would far better serve all concerned than the poorly thought out ribbon development of Offmore, that will blight the area for a far larger number of existing residents and at a greater cost, both financial and aesthetic to locals and visitors alike.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4590</a>	6.57	Comment	Why is the expanded Lea Castle site included within Option B not included in Option A and why is Blakedown excluded completely.
	<a href="#">LPPO4504</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Before any Green Belt is built on all Brownfield sites should be used first including Sladen and Sion Hill School sites. There are also many empty shops in Kidderminster which should be considered perhaps to provide apartments at reasonable prices. It would enhance the area which is very run down and does nothing to encourage visitors to return. There are also empty factory sites within the town which could be utilised in the same way.</p> <p>What about the area to the North of Kidderminster between Habberley, Franche Fairfield and Wolverley where there is a lot of open unused land surely this should be a consideration.</p> <p>I believe that a better option would be to create a new village on the Lea Castle site. The current proposal is for 600 homes, if this was extended to use land at the rear of the site and also include land up to the Wolverhampton Road and up to Axborough Lane it would become a fully sustainable community of 2000 homes or more. It could support its own Primary School, Bus Service and shops etc. It is a perfect site which is surrounded by Woodland and trees and therefore would not have a negative visual impact.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4603</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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.</p> <p>I also strongly suggest that you consider other brownfield sites such those I have</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO4635</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, partially owned by the Council and with limited economic benefit to the area. Similarly the site of the old quarry on the opposite side of the B4189 to the above site seems to have also been overlooked. There is brownfield land still not built on behind The Range at Crossley Park in Kidderminster. I strongly suggest that you consider other brownfield sites such those I have outlined in Wolverley to share the new build quota.
	<a href="#">LPPO4642</a>	6.57 Blakedown	Comment	I believe the Local Plan should include Blakedown given the recent new residential development there and as parking at Kidderminster station cannot easily be increased but could be at Blakedown.
	<a href="#">LPPO4527</a>	Ferndale	Comment	WFDC are wrong not to propose ANY development on the North/West of Kidderminster where 100-200 houses could be developed at the rear of the existing Ferndale Estate.
	<a href="#">LPPO4441</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>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 focusses 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 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="#">LPPO4686</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p><u>On page 178 Justification 31.1</u> 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.” This is not so I would counter that for two reasons:</p> <p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings located all</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>over it, partially owned by the council. These appear to have very limited economic benefit to the area.</p> <p>There is also the site of the old redundant quarry on the opposite side of the B4189 to the above site. There is also brownfield land still not built on behind The Range at Crossley Park in Kidderminster.</p> <p>There was also an application to build housing on the Churchfields site Kidderminster that remains un-developed, since the application was not allowed in 2015.</p> <p>Why is it these sites are not under consideration? Just because the government of the day allows you to build on greenfield sites, it does not mean you have to, especially when the above sites could be considered.</p> <p>I believe you have a duty to fully explore these options and give clear and transparent reasons to the public why you may not take them into account. I strongly suggest that you consider brownfield sites such those I have outlined.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4692</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of Lea Castle for sustainability. Widening of Deansford Lane - offers a sensible non destructive alternative.</li> </ul> <p>There are plenty of other development sites that will not impact local residents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3646</a>	Selba Drive	Object	<p>This area is used by many local residents for social activities (children playing or dog walking) removal of this would cause local people to have to go further away from their homes to continue these activities</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>9 homes would approximately mean another 18 vehicles (2 per household seems quite normal), which would need to be catered for in Selba Drive.</p> <p>In addition, the current excessive parking at the junction of Selba Drive &amp; Westminster Road has already caused many people to complain to the council. This is before the introduction of more vehicle traffic.</p> <p>With the new houses also built in the site of the Cooper's Arms (again with inadequate parking), it will increase on road parking at the other end of Westminster Road.</p> <p>There are plans to remove the old garages and put 4 more houses in the same site. Many cars go up there as it is, where are those meant to park once the work starts / completes?</p> <p>There is not enough space for the current number of vehicles. Adding potentially 18 more vehicles to park and use these roads will cause more problems.</p> <p>I can see a future of parking problems that will be a constant source of complaints.</p> <p>In a nut shell, this area cannot accommodate the traffic that will arise from this development.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4429</a>	Alternatives	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4702</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	Justification 31.1 it states “there is insufficient sustainably located readily available brownfield or non-Green Belt land to accommodate the necessary housing and

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>employment growth required in the plan period.” I would counter that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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> </ul> <p>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="#">LPPO4707</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>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.” I would counter that:</p> <p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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.</p> <p>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="#">LPPO4157</a>	Lea Castle	Support	<p>The Lea Castle site could be adopted as suitable for an initial large scale development, incorporating appropriate infrastructure such as schools, shops, GP</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				surgery, transport links, etc.
	<a href="#">LPPO3160</a>	Alternatives	Comment	We would like more consideration of developing brownfield sites, including the town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO3166</a>	Alternatives	Comment	We would like more consideration of developing brownfield sites, including the town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO3168</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Land is a precious resource, we need affordable housing to be built, but there are alternative Brownfield sites in Kidderminster and the surrounding areas. These could and should be used first.  Kidderminster town centre has opportunities for housing development. Use the existing infrastructure and consider building residential units or change of use.
	<a href="#">LPPO3212</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Extend the area to build on at Lea Castle include all the land from the A449 to A451 and to Axborough Lane.  Consider land at the rear of Ferndale estate.  Brownfield sites should be built on before destroying the Green Belt. Sladen school and Sion Hill school sites have still not built on. Do we need so many houses?
	<a href="#">LPPO3608</a>	Extended Lea Castle and Ferndale	Comment	I would like to propose the use of land at Lea Castle, this could be extended to use land up to the Wolverhampton Road and at the rear of the Lea Castle site, extending up to Axborough Lane. There could also be some development on the Western side of Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill which would link with the development at the Sion Hill Middle School site.  This development could create a sustainable village with all the required infrastructure to support it. It would support a village centre and would be large enough to support a primary school. The village would be able to sustain a bus

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>service and would not impact on the community of Cookley.</p> <p>In addition to this I feel that, WFDC should propose some degree of development on the north/West of Kidderminster and feel it would be reasonable to develop land at the read of the existing Ferndale estate which could accommodate 100-200 houses.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4891</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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> </ul> <p>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="#">LPPO4893</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO3828</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>I would like to propose the following:</p> <p>That consideration is given to developing firstly all the existing brownfield areas within Kidderminster. The most significant being the former Sladen and Sion Hill school sites.</p> <p>The former Lea Castle hospital site near Cookley, which is already earmarked for a development of 600 dwellings. This will put pressure on the existing facilities in Cookley namely the primary school and doctor’s surgery. If this were to be</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				increased to around 2,000 dwellings then the development would be eligible for its own school, bus service route and doctor's surgery, taking the pressure off the village of Cookley. As this area is on the other side of the A449 and already well screened by woodland it would not have a significant visual impact on the village.
	<a href="#">LPPO3555</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Brownbelt land must be utilised, empty Kidderminster shops to incorporate apartments above, utilise the top of Park Lane, behind Matalan in Kidderminster, properties in Green Street opposite Aldi.
	<a href="#">LPPO3860</a>	6.57 Lea Castle and Ferndale	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other options are more suitable.</li> <li>• why not development at the rear of existing Ferndale Estate.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3763</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>There is flatter land potentially available where the recently closed golf course is. It is a much larger plot of land so could accommodate quite a significant estate rather than the 80 properties being considered at present. It would also seem to be suitable on other levels such as traffic access as it is in closer proximity to the Stourport/Kidderminster dual carriageway.</p> <p>The only down side I can see compared to the existing proposal is that the council do not currently own the golf course land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4907</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>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." I would counter that:</p> <p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown West head Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Kidderminster.</p> <p>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="#">LPPO4915</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>The plan has not considered Blakedown. Section 13.21 and 13.22 recognises that parking at Kidderminster Railway station cannot be expanded easily but there is scope at Blakedown. I believe the Local Plan should be revisited to include Blakedown particularly given the recent new residential development in that area.</p> <p>The Local plan is biased. It should also cover Blakedown. It is not in accordance with the guidelines for Public Consultation and falls short of both YouGov and Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice and needs to be revisited.</p> <p>Kidderminster town centre as it is now is devastated. With the retail sector hit so hard by internet sales it seems unlikely that we can revitalise the old high street to sustainable levels. So why is nobody talking about converting the old Woolworths/Littlewoods buildings into nice new apartment blocks with plenty of accessible parking at the rear and only a short walk to both the station and weavers wharf and how this might help to stimulate the local economy in more effective ways?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4533</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>I believe a larger development at the Lea Castle site should be built to create a sustainable community with a new Primary School and a village centre. This would incorporate options A and B at lea Castle and extend the site to the Wolverhampton Road, to the rear of the Lea castle site and to the Axborough Lane.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4454</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>Are there really no brownfield sites left to develop?</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>I would like to see a more dynamic approach to bringing the centre back to life with apartments. Perhaps reduce the number of shops to provide land. Many shopping streets are now a relic of pre-retail park days. There are also tracts of old carpet factories used for small businesses. Not a good use of city centre land.</p> <p>I can't see any mention of eco-housing. Surely all proposed housing should far exceed minimum insulation standards and incorporate solar panels as standard.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4460</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Use brownfield sites plus significant use of the Lea Castle area which will have minimal impact on the present residential population.
	<a href="#">LPPO4751</a>	6.57 Alternative Sites	Comment	<p><b><u>Objective: To plan for Long Term Sustainable Development</u></b></p> <p>There's a clear need for a robust and approved local plan to be in force and for adequate land to be set aside for realistic, planned future development. However before any consideration, at all, is given to the re-designation of Green Belt land, there are other alternatives which should have prior consideration:-</p> <p>Brownfield sites – These include:- Victoria carpets' former sports ground; Kidderminster Golf Club and Car Park; Land North of Bernie Crossland Walk (Rear of Chester Road South); Land South of Bernie Crossland Walk; Chester Road South Service Station; Land at 78 Cherry Orchard; Comberton Place; Lea Street School; Stadium Close (also Aggborough Stadium); The former Polish Club;</p> <p>Other sites, including those in Stourport and Bewdley should be identified. These include, but not exclusively: Former school sites (including playing fields) at Sladen, Sion Hill, Stourminster and Blakebrook Schools, in Kidderminster and, maybe others in Stourport and Bewdley; the former Sugar Beet Factory site – A higher density of housing is probably feasible; the Lea Castle site – suitable for high density, affordable housing; the former Wyre Forest Glades site – should be re-designated for high density affordable housing; Redundant shops/offices in town</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>centres and elsewhere are suitable for conversion, or demolition and redevelopment:</p> <p>Kidderminster has numerous longstanding vacant premises, which are likely to attract only low rental occupation. Competition from Merry Hill, Worcester and, ever increasingly the internet, has had and will continue to have, adverse effects on the retail trade. The future retail needs of the town can be met by the Weavers Wharf development and Vicar Street. The remainder of the town (including the former 'Woolworths' and 'Littlewoods' sites and other empty shops in Worcester Street) is, therefore, potential for redevelopment. A massive area, extending to the former 'Glades' Centre and the Ring Road, is ideally suited for high density, affordable housing, which in present circumstances, appears to be much more important than more shops/cinema etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stourport has vacant shops and office space which could be considered for domestic use.</li> <li>• Bewdley also appears to have unoccupied properties and, in particular the HSBC has recently moved out of its premises. Town centre domestic units can be very attractive, particularly to young people.</li> <li>• Crown House – One of the worst eyesores in the UK. This would be best suited for urban open space but the site could be considered for domestic redevelopment.</li> <li>• Swan Centre – One of the least frequented shopping centres in the region. This could be demolished and re-developed.</li> </ul> <p>N.B. Compulsory purchases of town centre properties should be considered, where owners of designated units are reluctant to sell.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park Lane Kidderminster – vacant sites include long disused mill units opposite the Matalan site, the former 'Jewson' site and other possible</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>development land nearby. These may have been earmarked for an extension to Weavers Wharf but, in present circumstances, housing appears to be the priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aggborough Stadium. -The prospect of Kidderminster Harriers removing to the training ground site in Stourport Road has recently come to light. This would leave the stadium and car park site available for substantial, high density housing, in keeping with existing development of the surrounding area. This, it would appear, has not been taken into consideration in the Council’s planning.</li> <li>• The large site adjacent to ‘Tesco’ in Stourport – this is already fenced off and designated for development, but has remained undeveloped for several years.</li> <li>• The former sewerage treatment site in Wilden Lane, Hoobrook (backing on to McDonalds).</li> <li>• The development of open areas presently used for car parking. This would require the provision of multi-level car parking in the 3 towns.</li> <li>• Existing domestic properties within the 3 towns and available for purchase and redevelopment - possibly small sites suitable for one or two houses, properties available for demolition and use of large gardens.</li> <li>• The Countryside - Sensitive developments, especially where existing main roads provide essential access, e.g. Shenstone (A450), Mustow Green/Harvington/Stone (A448/A450), Low Habberley (B4190) and land at the junction of the A449 Wolverhampton Road/B4189 Wolverley Road and Park Gate Road etc. etc.</li> <li>• Local villages/residential areas – small housing developments in keeping with existing structures and avoiding essential Green Belt where possible. e.g. Chaddesley Corbett, Cookley, Wolverley etc. etc.</li> </ul> <p>N.B. “The modern trend of developing small ‘pocket’ communities has much to</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>commend it, when compared to the impersonal facelessness of large estates”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reviews - Sites where previous applications for planning permission have been refused should be reconsidered – these are likely to be numerous. Priorities for the future are changed and decisions now outdated.</li> </ul> <p>N.B. It is unfair that the south-east of Kidderminster has borne the brunt of expansion over the last 4 decades and is again in the forefront for planned new development.</p> <p>There are other Green Belt and other areas in Wyre Forest, around Kidderminster, Stourport, Wribbenhall, Bewdley and the local villages (not considered in either Option A or Option B), with potential access from existing main roads.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4505</a>	6.57 - Extended Lea Castle	Support	Support Lea Castle
	<a href="#">LPPO4172</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Has site of Glades Leisure centre been considered for apartments? Can old part of the Kidderminster Town Centre be turned into apartments?
	<a href="#">LPPO4509</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Primary areas for development need to be areas already used, brownfield sites. The development of Lea Castle site is a much needed area of development. The site itself already contains the basic needed for a housing complex and the road network is such that it can take the weight of traffic.</p> <p>Development that allows for the building of the eastern relief road enables people to be connected to major road networks, allowing them to commute without getting gridlocked in town traffic.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4638</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	Use brownfield land for affordable housing
	<a href="#">LPPO3793</a>	6.57	Comment	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

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>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.</p> <p>To build on the proposed Green Belt land 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.</p> <p>I truly hope you take Lea Castle and the Ferndale estate into consideration before destroying our lovely countryside.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4652</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>I would suggest that an <u>Option C</u> should be considered, that utilises more than the designated area around Lea Castle, and builds sufficient houses there to justify a school, and a shopping and community centre. Residents could then do local shopping on site and not need to travel so often to the town centre.</p> <p>I am not commenting out of self-interest, I am thinking of future generations who could have their own school in an enlarged Lea Castle complex.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4679</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use existing empty properties in the town centre (eg. Woolworths site), for the proposed leisure complex (cinema/bowling alley) or move it more towards the Weavers Wharf area to stop the town centre becoming divided and further disjointed. The Lionfields site could then all be dedicated to housing/residential. Other empty buildings here could then be made into restaurants/cafes and the road not opened up to traffic to allow a 'café culture' with outside seating etc.</li> </ul> <p>The monies saved (£500,000) from opening up the road (keep it pedestrianised to promote said café culture) could be used to compulsory purchase these buildings</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>and revamp this area of town. It is also closer to the main shopping areas on Weavers Wharf than Lionfields thus stopping even further segregation of the town centre.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is waste land where Sladen School on Hurcott Road once stood as this was demolished in 2009 and also Sion Hill School. The Magistrates Court and offices should be made into residential housing.</li> <li>• Churchfields site should also be developed (some 3000 houses can be built here according to Ian Hardiman).</li> <li>• Use Lea Castle Hospital site (brownfield site in options A and B combined) for 600-700 houses. Then 10 – 15 years on, further development of Lea Castle Hospital and School site - use of Green Belt extension if absolutely necessary. Green Belt at Lea Castle only released at this stage if deemed necessary for increased housing. No Green Belt site to be released until housing needs are reviewed after 10 years.</li> <li>• I also think that the idea of a cinema on the ex-Glades site is not a good plan. This land could be used for housing and the proposed cinema (if really needed) sited nearer the heart of Kidderminster, and not cut the town into two parts. Is a cinema the future or are green fields for our children and children’s children? What then of the vacant REEL cinema...more housing?</li> </ul> <p>We need small scale town centre apartments and flats for our younger people and older residents and not large mass housing 3 to 4 miles outside of a town with poor transport or facilities. Building retirement housing near the town centre will also free up more large family sized homes as per your report, thus negating any need for further building. Smaller flats and apartments will have smaller land footprints too, making the land mass an important factor in determining housing numbers and reducing the overall land required.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of an entire rural village on Lea Castle Hospital and School site.</li> <li>• Kidderminster town centre has at least 40 large shops and office blocks that stand empty, some for well over a decade. The town centre is in urgent need of regeneration, and I believe that Compulsory Purchase Orders should be made on these. There is waste land where Sladen School on Hurcott Road once stood as this was demolished in 2009 and also Sion Hill School. The Magistrates court and offices should be made into residential apartments.</li> <li>• Re-evaluate the whole 'need' for housing figures and reassess land availability to include recent windfall sites such as Kidderminster Harriers site, Victoria Carpets, Wood Yard next to Matalan etc. Build higher rise, or convert more flats in the town centre to boost numbers (smaller build footprints) for the elderly and younger generation (a good example is Comberton Hill), therefore freeing up existing larger homes.</li> <li>• Stourport in particular also has a number of brownfield sites which are in need of development in order to meet some of the local housing needs of a growing/developing town centre. The now defunct Wyre Forest Golf Course has released some land and there is no reason why the rest should not be released for housing development.</li> </ul> <p>I therefore state that all brownfield sites and existing sites must be developed first, and that no land be removed from the Green Belt for at least a minimum period of 10 years.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4168</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>There is also alternative land abutting south east of Highclere (Land Registry Title no WR95003) that could be incorporated to support improved highway access and additional residential development to avoid the traffic congestion and dangers for both pedestrians and vehicles that already exist at the higher levels in the Park Lane area. This site could also provide improved recreational facilities. It also</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				offers easy access to Bewdley town centre without the need to traverse and negotiate the hazards of Park Lane.
	<a href="#">LPPO4626</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	There are many alternatives available to develop and expand in and around Kidderminster - several buildings are derelict and have been for several years which could be used for the 1700 homes that you wish to implement. In turn, this could improve the regeneration of Kidderminster town centre and bring the business you desire to the area.
	<a href="#">LPPO3529</a>	Selba Drive	Object	<p>Our own children and their friends made good use of this space playing football, cricket, hide n seek, etc as do our grandchildren.</p> <p>You are building or built Family homes on garage, pub, hall and church sites I assume FAMILY means people with children, just where do you think these families are going to go for a kick about hide n seek, ride their bikes exercise etc (NO BALL GAME SIGNS ARE AROUND THE ESTATE) in a fairly safe environment without being a nuisance to other residents or shop owners children have to play somewhere!The existing parks great for smaller children but not adequate for older ones in the area.</p> <p>We sincerely hope that you can leave us and future residents of Habberley Estate A little bit of green space for us all to enjoy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3997</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Object	There are viable alternatives in Wyre Forest, some of which do not appear to have been fully considered in the current proposals. I do not feel that you have given full consideration to all of the brownfield sites in the Wyre Forest District. We need affordable homes and these do not have to be houses, there is still considerable scope for brownfield development of apartments and flats e.g. Park Lane in Kidderminster, Green Street, site of Crown House, sites of former schools, the Jobcentre etc. Furthermore, with an aging population, we need suitable housing for elderly people to downsize to, developments near town centres and

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>shops are ideal for this. Releasing Green Belt land for development looks like the easy (or lazy) option. You have a responsibility to the people of Wyre Forest to protect our Green Belt wherever possible and I do not believe you have demonstrated that there are insufficient brownfield (or green field non-Green Belt) alternatives.</p> <p>To ensure that any development has good road access and facilities I would support a 'Spennells type' development on the Lea Castle site, which would mean expanding the current proposals for that site. A full development on that site would support a primary school, providing a much needed additional feeder school for Wolverley High school. Creating a 'second Spennells' on the Lea castle site would actually have less impact on local residents as (like Spennells) it could be self-sustaining with the opportunity to provide shops and live/work units providing employment opportunities. Also the Lea Castle site has better road access, being situated between two A roads it already has the necessary road infrastructure as the Wolverhampton Road and Stourbridge Road are already linked (similar to the Spennells Valley Road). This means there would be no 'rat runs' created through residential streets, unlike the Baldwin Road scenario, which would create havoc on the residential streets in the Greenhill area.</p> <p>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="#">LPPO4466</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Support infill development to south of Kidderminster
	<a href="#">LPPO4690</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	There are still plenty of brownfield sites that should be developed before building on Green Belt land. Half of Kidderminster town centre is empty and abandoned. Town centre development would massively enhance the centre of Kidderminster and reduce the need to travel which would benefit air quality and cause less traffic

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>congestion. The old Glades site and Bromsgrove Street car park which is always empty now. The old abandoned law courts, countless old factories. Old school sites such as Sladen and Sion Hill. The falling down buildings in the Horsefair which I think most people would agree is the street that most desperately requires the Council's help and vast improvements could be made. There are many options that should be implemented first instead of the Council choosing the 'easiest' for development.</p> <p>If houses still have to be built then the Lea Castle site could be extended up to the Wolverhampton Road which I believe wouldn't cause as much upset and loss of quality of life as Options A or B would.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4434</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<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 Lee 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>
	<a href="#">LPPO4430</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>The poor state of Kidderminster town centre in combination with poor traffic management and congestion around the station do not make Kidderminster an attractive base for commuters working in Birmingham. I believe that development of those brownfield sites closer to the town centre should be maximised to their full potential to ensure housing is affordable and in the right location to provide easy access to amenities and employment for those with both limited means and reduced mobility, particularly the elderly.</p> <p>I propose WFDC also make sustained efforts to encourage development of the Lea Castle, Sion Hill and Sladen school sites which are in prime locations and for which</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				local infrastructure is already present.
	<a href="#">LPPO4625</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	Derelict school area at Sion Hill, the old Sladen School site are two I passed yesterday on the way home. Both of these are large areas with the ability to host adequate parking.
	<a href="#">LPPO3410</a>	Alternative sites	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kidderminster town centre could provide more housing.</li> <li>• Could use Worcester Street, Bromsgrove Street and The Glades - those housed would then be in walking distance to a lot of services.</li> <li>• 'Political will' at national level needed to deter land banking.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3087</a>	Development Suggestions	Comment	<p>Extensions to the Lea Castle site (as in WFDC Options A and B) should be utilised; and land on the Lea Castle site which constitutes the field(s) alongside the Wolverhampton Rd and a "rear" extension of Lea Castle up to Axborough Lane should also be included. This use of land could create a "Lea Castle Village" with around 1,800-2,000 houses. This would create a wholly sustainable community which would be large enough to have a village centre, primary school, community facilities and sustain a bus service. In addition, being in the catchment area of Wolverley High School it would help to make that school sustainable.</p> <p>Further some extension into land adjacent to the Wolverhampton Rd/Wolverley Rd area and Sion Hill Middle School site could also be considered and could provide another 200-300 houses. Development in this area is supported by two main A roads the A449 and A451.</p> <p>I have noted that there is no proposed development at all to the western Kidderminster estates. However a development of 100 – 200 houses as an extension to the Ferndale estate could and should be considered. This estate also has reasonable access to the A449 via Wolverley and could support such a development. In addition there are surplus Secondary School places available to</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				serve this area as Baxter College is seriously undersubscribed.
	<a href="#">LPPO3109</a>	Lea Castle Hospital	Support	This site would be large enough to warrant building all the facilities lacking on the Baldwin Road site. This option would generate a feeling of community spirit and a nice area to live. This choice of site would also please the hundreds of people affected by the use of any of the other proposals.
	<a href="#">LPPO4928</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create two clear focus development areas and <u>not</u> a long featureless strip as current.</li> <li>• Maximise development on Lea Castle Hospital site. Include all land up to Axborough Lane, Stourbridge Road and Wolverhampton Road. Include the South (WC/16) and East (WC/32) extensions also. Create a community to include shops, school and bus routes.</li> <li>• Maximise housing development at or near the Kidderminster Enterprise Park – for obvious traffic congestion and environmental reasons. This all include AS/10 and OC/13. Can even more land be obtained in and around Stone?</li> <li>• Ensure Hurcott Lane issue is resolved. Access to Hurcott Woods to be preserved for everyone in the WF community and beyond – but terminating access at the Hurcott Woods car park (in effect making Hurcott Lane a no through road) is a serious option for consideration. Traffic calming chicanes or humps at the edges of Hurcott Village should be considered also.</li> <li>• Existing Core Housing Sites to be reviewed and abandoned if possible. If parts of them must be used – ensure they are done last in the development calendar – after the above two focus development areas are completed.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4537</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	Kidderminster itself would benefit from further regeneration. This could include developing new, quality and affordable homes in Kidderminster itself and on

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				undeveloped brownfield sites.  This could be resolved by a smaller development south of Park Gate Road only.
	<a href="#">LPPO4518</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	The town centre is like a ghost town as it is with all the derelict shops people are moving away from the area not into it.
	<a href="#">LPPO3382</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	The Proposal of a sustainable Village at Lea Castle could be explored more thoroughly allowing 2,000 houses, large enough for a primary school and a bus service, services are already available.  Ferndale estate could be extended further, Sladen Site or Sion Hill Middle sch site, the old GPO offices and Magistrates Court? I believe the Brownfield sites within Kidderminster should be looked at as a priority before destroying our beloved and precious Green Belt land, cost alone should not sway this.
	<a href="#">LPPO4523</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	Any buildings needed would first be built on the brownfield sites that w.f.d.c. have at their disposal. Such as Lea Castle, Sion Hill, Sladen, the old Wyre forest golf course, disused factory units, Stourminster School, the old Victoria cricket ground to name a few that I know of.
	<a href="#">LPPO4525</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	I believe that there are other sites under consideration which would seem more suitable, in particular the Old Ceramaspeed site in Kidderminster.
	<a href="#">LPPO4375</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Core Housing Sites that could replace Option A to the South of Kidderminster: 'Timber Yard Park Lane' and 'Bromsgrove St' (excluding the Glades site).
	<a href="#">LPPO4365</a>	Alternatives	Comment	There are numerous brown site areas in the area namely Sion Hill school Lea castle hospital Stourminster school also land in park street and various other small sites in the area although we realise would be more costly would undoubtedly clear up some derilict eyesores.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4624</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	I am at a loss to understand why the site of the former Glades leisure complex cannot be used for house building instead of a cinema etc., at least this will bring necessary footfall to the shops. There are many empty shops in Worcester Street, why cannot these be turned into dwellings?
	<a href="#">LPPO4387</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	Rear of Ceramaspeed - It is on an industrial estate and has wide roads leading to it, which are able to cope with large vehicles. More suitable for Travelling Showpeople site. The surrounding roads also seem to be less busy with day-to-day traffic.
	<a href="#">LPPO4388</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	Rear of Ceramaspeed -This is a far more suitable space for Travelling Showpeople: the industrial estate offers wide roads leading into it, specifically built for large and often articulated vehicles.  The roads are less congested by heavy day-to-day traffic so the impact on the general public would be much less.
	<a href="#">LPPO4298</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under-used warehouse buildings around the centre of Kidderminster</li> <li>• The redundant leisure centre / health centre site.</li> <li>• The large number of empty shops in the town centre including so many redundant upper storeys above the shop fronts.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4544</a>	6.57	Comment	I believe it would be more beneficial to make use of the brownfield sites to create more homes and to re-generate the town itself, there are several buildings which would be better utilised in this way rather than left to rot and make the town look like an eyesore. My suggestions are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land which used to be the Glades Leisure Centre, I know there is consultation for it to become a multiplex Cinema which in an ideal world I think would be a brilliant idea, however, realistically speaking young</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>people, families etc. do not attend cinemas as it is far too costly and with modern technology such as Sky, Virgin, Amazon firesticks etc, they can watch all they want by using these methods of viewing at a lot less cost. This is why I think this land would be of more benefit by using it for housing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. All the empty shops in Worcester Steet, i.e. the old Woolworths, Littlewoods stores and the large amount of charity shops.</li> <li>3. The Old Magistrates Court.</li> <li>4. The disused timber yard and warehousing behind Matalan, this would be perfect for town houses or Apartments for canalside living similar to areas in Birmingham which have been re-generated with fantastic restaurants etc.</li> <li>5. Sion Hill School.</li> <li>6. Sladen School.</li> <li>7. The Old Lea Castle Hospital would be ideal as it has two major roads either side of it which would be able to handle the extra volume of traffic no problem, I am confident of this as I travel along these roads everyday to work and there is nowhere near as much traffic on these roads as there is around the Spennells/Aggborough/Offmore areas. The plan to use Lea Castle would also mean using less Green Belt Land than the Spennells proposition.</li> </ol> <p>I have lived in Kidderminster for 34 years and have watched the decline of the town over a number of these years I desperately would love the council to carry on rejuvenating the town itself and make it a pleasurable place to visit with more restaurants, maybe an entertainment venue for concerts, shows etc rather than taking away our valuable Green Belt land which once gone will be gone forever.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4763</a>	6.57 Alternative Sites	Comment	On page 178 Justification 31.1 it states “there is insufficient sustainably located readily available brownfield or non-Green Belt land to accommodate the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>necessary housing and employment growth required in the plan period.” Why are there no brownfield sites on the plan? ie Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it), 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. Why have these areas not been considered and if so then please can you advise on why they are unsuitable ?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4766</a>	6.57 Alternative Sites	Comment	<p>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.” Why are there no brownfield sites on the plan? ie Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it), 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. Why have these areas not been considered and if so then please can you advise on why they are unsuitable?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4865</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>We have numerous brownfield sites, that should and must be built on first, they include old derelict factory units in Green Street, same in Park Lane, the old magistrates court bottom of Comberton Hill, Bromsgrove Street, empty premises in Worcester Street, the land where Sladen school once stood, Sion Hill school. In Stourport we have two parcels of land next to Tesco, plus the old leisure centre land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4870</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>A further and up to date review must be made of available development land in Kidderminster. The Wood Yard to the side of Matalan and buildings behind are all now vacant since the review was completed, as well as the Magistrates Court and many other buildings. If these are not released by the owners, then WFDC should</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>utilise funds and compulsory purchase these sites to develop.</p> <p>It has also been suggested that discussions are ongoing around land available at Kidderminster Harriers for housing. This must be factored into numbers. Some accountability must be taken for further windfall sites occurring, such as the recent carpet factory closures.</p> <p>Move the proposed cinema off Lionfields to one of the empty buildings in the town centre, with associated pubs and restaurants, thus bringing it closer to the Weavers Wharf development, freeing up a lot of space at Lionfields for retirement housing, or young people apartments that would breath more life and energy into Kidderminster, especially early evenings as other towns and cities have done. Comberton Hill development is a very good example of this.</p> <p>With the building of a new cinema, this would release the site of the current 'REEL' cinema for further apartments or resolve the need for additional employment spaces at Easter Park. Many small business owners find it difficult to lease small offices. All that is proposed are large industrial units, there should be a mix.</p> <p>Use both option A and option B for the Lea Castle site, with further development of the site to create a new village with its own identity and facilities, thus supporting the much needed provision of new infrastructure in that area and creating a road to take the traffic to Birmingham from this side of Kidderminster away from the Horsefair and ring road.</p> <p>Development of the array of empty premises in Kidderminster for housing use. Revisit all 'vacant' property in Kidderminster and the use of CPOs as required. Approach Housing associations to support with this.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4494</a>	6.57 Alternative	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worcester St; Bromsgrove St car park (exc Fabric shop) plus Glades area.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
		suggestions		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vicar St – over the shops esp former WFDC offices.</li> <li>• Corner of Coventry St/Blackwell St – appears in disrepair</li> <li>• Green St l/h side – the building backing onto Morrisons car park appears to be unoccupied and further down on the left hand side (past Dixon St opposite B&amp;Q) inc the building currently partly used as offices.</li> <li>• Corner of Church St/Ring Rd – shop unoccupied since it was the “Medical Hall”, Church St further accommodation to let .</li> </ul> <p><i>I am sure if you look there's plenty more.</i></p> <p>CROWN HOUSE – a car park with accommodation/just accommodation? Maybe inc walkway to the Swan Centre.</p> <p>Make Kidderminster an attractive place; to live, work and shop– be innovative - a forerunner!</p> <p><b>Planners:</b> -Look at towns on the Continent for inspiration eg France and Germany.</p> <p>Kidderminster town has the potential to be an attractive town with some very nice brick built buildings housing shops, an attractive Town Hall and buildings eg Lloyds Bank but we do have some very unattractive buildings, many empty shops.</p> <p>Along Worcester St there are 12 exc the old Woolworths building. All of the one side of Worcester St backing on to Bromsgrove St could be converted into living accommodation/OAP complex (location pos alleviate loneliness). Incentivise any remaining shops there to move to empty shops elsewhere in town. Any objections/obstacles must be overcome before Green Belt land is considered for building . Bromsgrove St car park and Glades area could be regenerated with housing only inc some green spaces but not so as to encourage anti social</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>behaviour as in Coronation Gardens.</p> <p>Crown House must be demolished; it is an eyesore taking up valuable land. As a nation we cannot afford to continue using land for car parks so multi story car parks must be built rather than surface car parks. So I suggest we demolish Crown House and replace with an attractive brick built multi story car park with the money ear marked to be spent on Worcester St) with living accommodation on the top (as on the Continent) with own secure parking.</p> <p>Nationally as well as locally we should look at every available space for living accommodation. Towns are not what they used to be so we should regenerate them into vibrant areas where people want to live.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3465</a>	Para 6.57	Comment	<p>All on going sites that have been left and not developed and are now in a disgusting state, should be finished before any green fields are even touched eg. Sion Hill School, Yew Tree Pub in Broadwaters and Lea Castle Hospital.</p> <p>The centre of Kidderminster is a disgrace. The retail premises that will never ever be used again for business should now be redeveloped for both residential and commercial use, bringing life back into a dying town. This will make it a young vibrant place to live (not everyone wants a house with a garden). The development of the inner town must the priority long before any further outward expansion of Kidderminster is even dreamed of.</p> <p>All roads and transport infrastructure must clearly defined and planned for before any future developments are contemplated.</p> <p>Education provision should be firmly planned for now, not left for future thought. Health care also needs to be planned for jointly with the NHS.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4538</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>We believe that there may be a better option that would safeguard the habitats and lives of the mammals, birds and bats in this area. We suggest that more should be considered on the Lea Castle Site. The footprint of the old hospital has been ear marked for the building of 600 dwellings but the site could accommodate many more. And with a little development on the fringes there it would provide sustainable community that could support its own primary school, and wouldn't be a burden on the Cookley Parish.</p> <p>We ask you to seriously consider the development of the Lea Castle site as a sustainable community and a viable option which would reduce the impact on the proposed Green Belt diminution.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4697</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>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.” I would counter that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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> </ul> <p>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="#">LPPO4542</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>I note Lea Castle site is included in your options but I feel this could be further developed to create more of a brand new sustainable community rather than</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>numerous “add ons” to already established existing areas</p> <p>If the site at Lea Castle were expanded, as it could be, to provide all the current additional housing required this would create more of a community which in turn could provide a new primary school (Offmore school, as I’m sure you are aware, is full to capacity and cannot be extended), also shops and a community area. This would also appeal more to people moving into the area, a brand new site including new local amenities</p> <p>Traffic and new roads could also be better managed and accommodated at this site rather than adding some form of eastern bypass, which would also have to take into consideration the rail track and possible very costly new bridge</p> <p>I would please ask that you consider alternative options and work on creating a new community within Wyre Forest as opposed to causing disconcert to your already established areas.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3494</a>	Para 6.57	Comment	<p>There are many sites that should be used: Lea Castle, Sion Hill, Sladen and particularly the old town centre, which is a disgrace, before dwellings are constructed on virgin land. Before any of this building goes ahead the plans for the infrastructure should be passed. Where is the money for the infrastructure coming from? We will need new schools, new Doctors Surgeries and hospitals. The current local hospitals have reached crises point and GP practices are not coping; they cannot get the staff. More doctors and medical staff need to be trained and that takes years. The local schools are full, so more money will need to be spent building new schools. Where is the money coming from?</p> <p>Kidderminster has great potential; it has canals and rivers and a few years ago was a thriving market town surrounded by beautiful country side, but if we are not careful it will become a commuter town that no one wants to visit. Before any</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				more dwellings are built we need to sort the old town centre out, by replacing the empty shops with desirable dwellings and businesses and making it once again a rural town that visitors want to visit.
	<a href="#">LPPO4303</a>	Alternatives	Comment	I propose the use of existing brownfield sites 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 costs. 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4361</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Rezone areas of Kidderminster town centre for housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO3237</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Plan heavily focused on large development in one area ie Option A Spennells and Hurcott. Fairer to have spread out whatever homes that are needed across more areas. Why nothing in other areas?
	<a href="#">LPPO4258</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Build your houses in the old, empty Woolworths site, on the old Glades site, on Lea Castle, on the old Sladen Site, on the old Sion Hill site, bulldoze the The Horsefair and regenerate this area!
	<a href="#">LPPO3194</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	<p>Alternative Proposal: A Lea Castle “Sustainable Village”</p> <p>Proposed lea castle land extending to the edge of the wolverhampton road at the rear of the site, possibly some development on the western side of wolverly towards sion hill to link with the new development at the sion hill school.</p> <p>Advantages of this proposal: with the additional land we propose including sites in the vicinity already identified by WFDC we believe a community of 2500 houses could be created</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it would be large enough to support a 2 form entry primary school</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it would support a village centre and cookley parish without burdening existing facilities</li> <li>• it would be capable of sustaining a bus service</li> <li>• provide like-work units</li> <li>• good impact on the longevity of Wolverly CE high school.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4196</a>	Kidderminster Town Centre	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building more homes around the town centres will reduce car journeys and pollution.</li> <li>• This will regenerate the town centres, to make them more attractive</li> <li>• It is the centre of Kidderminster for example which requires the major investment.</li> <li>• Spreading the home building requirement around other smaller sites will reduce the radical changes in communities across the region.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3424</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>Whilst I understand the need for development and understand that inevitably this land will eventually be developed as an expansion of Kidderminster, the immediate development I feel should take into account previously developed land of other areas in Kidderminster, including:</p> <p>Lea Castle hospital site and the former school sites of Sion Hill and Sladen and also the empty buildings along the canal behind Matalan. Once the empty shops in Kidderminster have been regenerated then the space above these stores could also be converted in to flats.</p> <p><b>I would like to propose the following concerning the general development of the eastern Kidderminster area.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That consideration is given to developing firstly all the existing brownfield</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>and/or previously developed areas within Kidderminster. The most significant being the former Sladen and Sion Hill school sites and Lea Castle Hospital site near Cookley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The former Lea Castle hospital site near Cookley, which is already earmarked for a development of 600 dwelling will put pressure on the existing facilities in Cookley namely the primary School and doctor’s surgery. If this site was to be extended to include the land up to the Wolverhampton Road and then Axborough Lane at the rear of the Lea Castle site, then this would enable around 2,000 dwellings to be built. The development would then be a sustainable community and be eligible for its own school, bus service and doctor’s surgery, taking the pressure off the village of Cookley. As this area is on the other side of the A449 and already well screened by woodland it would not have a significant visual impact on the village. It would then also be in the catchment area for Wolverley CE High School.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4555</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	<p>There are far more obvious choices to build much needed housing than the Spennells proposed site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Firstly the old Lea Castle grounds</li> <li>Also Kidderminster Town Centre, so many empty buildings – make use of this</li> <li>The Old Post Office building. Yes this is an ugly building but make use of it</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO3318</a>	Lea Castle - Sustainable Village	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports Lea Castle proposal so we don't use Green Belt.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4428</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Object	<p>On page 178 Justification 31.1 it states “there is insufficient sustainably located readily available brownfield or non-Green Belt land to accommodate the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>necessary housing and employment growth required in the plan period.” I would counter that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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> </ul> <p>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="#">LPPO4464</a>	Alternative sites	Comment	<p>The plan has not considered Blakedown. Section 13.21 and 13.22 recognises that parking at Kidderminster Railway station cannot be expanded easily but there is scope at Blakedown. I believe the Local Plan should be revisited to include Blakedown particularly given the recent new residential development in that area.</p> <p>The Local plan is biased. It should also cover Blakedown. It is not in accordance with the guidelines for Public Consultation and falls short of both YouGov and Rural and Town Planning Institute best practice and needs to be revisited.</p> <p>Kidderminster town centre as it is now is devastated. With the retail sector hit so hard by internet sales it seems unlikely that we can revitalise the old high street to sustainable levels. So why is nobody talking about converting the old Woolworths/Littlewoods buildings into nice new apartment blocks with plenty of accessible parking at the rear and only a short walk to both the station and weavers wharf and how this might help to stimulate the local economy in more effective ways?</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3557</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Any new developments should be in brownsites wherever possible.
	<a href="#">LPPO3943</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>I would urge the Council to explore fully and rigorously pursue all brownfield sites and Green Belt use 'would be a last resort'.</p> <p>There are redundant, buildings in Kidderminster town centre that are ripe for conversion. Buildings are becoming available, even since the publication of the Draft Local Plan, for example the re-location of the Job Centre. Regeneration of Kidderminster town centre must be central to WFDC priorities. In the absence of any SWOT analysis, how can we assume that we can attract people to the area and fulfil the anticipated population growth? Without a commitment to and rapid development of the town centre, we run the risk of depleting our Green Belt for the purposes of unfounded WFDC aspirations.</p> <p>We may face the scenario of many empty newly built houses, sacrificed Green Belt, serious disregard for environmental issues, a nebulous plan for an Eastern Relief Road, but no plan for a road to alleviate traffic congestion from both the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge roads, areas to which the OAHN Report suggests we have greatest connection.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3091</a>	Alternative sites	Comment	Extensions to the Lea Castle site (as in WFDC Options A and B) should be utilised; and land on the Lea Castle site which constitutes the field(s) alongside the Wolverhampton Rd and a "rear" extension of Lea Castle up to Axborough Lane should also be included. This use of land could create a "Lea Castle Village" with around 1,800-2,000 houses. This would create a wholly sustainable community which would be large enough to have a village centre, primary school, community facilities and sustain a bus service. In addition, being in the catchment area of Wolverley High School it would help to make that school sustainable.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Further some extension into land adjacent to the Wolverhampton Rd/Wolverley Rd area and Sion Hill Middle School site could also be considered and could provide another 200-300 houses. Development in this area is supported by two main A roads the A449 and A451.</p> <p>I have noted that there is no proposed development at all to the western Kidderminster estates. However a development of 100 – 200 houses as an extension to the Ferndale estate could and should be considered. This estate also has reasonable access to the A449 via Wolverley and could support such a development. In addition there are surplus Secondary School places available to serve this area as Baxter College is seriously undersubscribed.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4884</a>	6.57 Extended Lea Castle	Comment	<p>The Lea Castle site offers a great opportunity to have a comprehensive plan for a sustainable community with every amenity available that would make a first class environment. With the Wolverley High School available, a new primary school would be warranted. The entire area should be included by immediately approaching the landowner of the remaining area, with a generous offer. The areas on the other side of the A449 would complement this development, with good access to major roads.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4500</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p><b>Proposal:</b> To FULLY develop the Lea Castle site with the construction of 1000 plus dwellings supporting its own schools, shops, businesses and other amenities which smaller developments would be incapable of. This would ameliorate the necessity of travelling to other locations so overall traffic would be reduced.</p> <p>I acknowledge and accept that, with increasing population, provision has to be made for additional housing. Thus, my recommendation would be to FULLY develop the Lea Castle site to its FULL potential of in excess of 1000 homes etc as above. Lea Castle can be accessed by TWO main routes, namely A491 and A449 in addition to secondary roads and is of sufficiently far from Stourbridge to maintain</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>substantial “green” areas for environmental and aesthetic advantage.</p> <p>This single development, if adopted, would more than compensate for several of the lesser projects such as Baldwin Road and South of Stourbridge Road, Hurcott.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4501</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p><b>Proposal:</b> To FULLY develop the Lea Castle site with the construction of 1000 plus dwellings supporting its own schools, shops, businesses and other amenities which smaller developments would be incapable of. This would ameliorate the necessity of travelling to other locations so overall traffic would be reduced.</p> <p>I acknowledge and accept that, with increasing population, provision has to be made for additional housing. Thus, my recommendation would be to FULLY develop the Lea Castle site to its FULL potential of in excess of 1000 homes etc as above. Lea Castle can be accessed by TWO main routes, namely A491 and A449 in addition to secondary roads and is of sufficiently far from Stourbridge to maintain substantial “green” areas for environmental and aesthetic advantage.</p> <p>This single development, if adopted, would more than compensate for several of the lesser projects such as Baldwin Road and South of Stourbridge Road, Hurcott.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4789</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	Develop land at rear existing Ferndale estate and on western side of Wolverley Road to link up with the Sion Hill school site.
	<a href="#">LPPO4791</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the Lea Castle site as a sustainable community with own Primary School so as not to impact on Cookley Village.</li> <li>• Positive impact on Wolverley High School’s long term viability.</li> <li>• Regenerate the town centre/empty sites through area</li> <li>• Include other sites in the North/West of Kidderminster, Bewdley and Stourport on Severn</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4792</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the Lea Castle site as a sustainable community with own Primary School so as not to impact on Cookley Village .</li> <li>• Positive impact on Wolverley High School’s long term viability.</li> <li>• Regenerate the town centre/empty sites through area</li> <li>• Include other sites in the North/West of Kidderminster, Bewdley and Stourport on Severn.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4828</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>There is an overprovision of retail within the town particularly around Worcester Street.</p> <p>There may well be potential for further development along the River Stour and canal.</p> <p>With 2500 on the housing waiting list and the sort of affordable housing for which there is the greatest need would be best provided within the town centre vicinity where amenities are greatest.</p> <p>Development should be based initially on brownfield sites as well as the Lea Castle hospital site. The quantum of these appear to be well over 4000 plots. Greater scrutiny is needed to ascertain additional redevelopment potential within the town centre where over provision of retail accommodation is leading to large numbers of empty and underutilised shops.</p> <p>The sort of affordable housing for which there is the greatest need would be best provided within the town centre vicinity where amenities are greatest.</p> <p>Should be greater emphasis on town centre redevelopment, wider dispersal across the District as set out in Option B. This would include Lea Castle and potentially sites to the west of the District and also potential expansion of Chaddesley,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				Harvington and Blakedown which are nearer Birmingham and the Black Country.
	<a href="#">LPPO4796</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	Kidderminster Town Centre requires urgent attention to revive it. The removal of the outdated and outmoded shops on the left side of Worcester Street, the Woolworth building etc, would give room to emulate the successful conversion of the Wyre Forest Housing offices. This would give reasonable density, affordable housing in the middle of town. Owners/tenants would be close to shops, bus and train connections, as well as the Council Hub and new Medical Centre. We need to lobby the Government if need be, to rejuvenate the centre of town, there are many small areas of brownfield sites which are still waiting to be taken in hand. Please, for everyone's sake, ignore the blandishments of large building companies, and use local builders to make the town hum again.
	<a href="#">LPPO4795</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	Kidderminster Town Centre requires urgent attention to revive it. The removal of the outdated and outmoded shops on the left side of Worcester Street, the Woolworth building etc, would give room to emulate the successful conversion of the Wyre Forest Housing offices. This would give reasonable density, affordable housing in the middle of town. Owners/tenants would be close to shops, bus and train connections, as well as the Council Hub and new Medical Centre. We need to lobby the Government if need be, to rejuvenate the centre of town, there are many small areas of brownfield sites which are still waiting to be taken in hand. Please, for everyone's sake, ignore the blandishments of large building companies, and use local builders to make the town hum again.
	<a href="#">LPPO3960</a>	Alternative suggestions	Comment	Develop the Lea Castle site with additional land proposed which we believe would sustain a community of between 2000 and 2500 house, which would support a 2 form entry Primary School and would not impact on Cookley Village Centre. It would be within the catchment area of Wolverley High School and would positively impact on its long term viability.  There are many empty sites around the Kidderminster area, i.e. Sladen School site,

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Sion Hill School site, the Horsefair, and land in Park Lane leading to Matalan which could be used for housing. Also the town centre needs regenerating — why not use the Crown House for flats, the top of shops in Worcester Street as flats and also use the Glades land and surrounding land for housing.</p> <p>Kidderminster does not need a Multicomplex cinema and more shops. The cinemas in the surrounding areas are empty because of the cost of tickets.</p> <p>WFDC is wrong not to propose any development on the north/west of Kidderminster, Bewdley or Stourport on Severn as we feel there are areas which could be developed within these catchment areas.</p> <p>Why have Franche and Ferndale not been included in the Options, both areas have fields many of which are used for horse grazing.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4290</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	<p>Building on non-agricultural land, such as Lea Castle must be a better option.</p> <p>Would enable a ‘community spirit’ to develop, and a new Primary School and shops could be built.</p> <p>This area is within easy reach of the town centre and hospital and has good road links for a bus service.</p> <p>Better relief for the Horsefair would come from a complete redevelopment with flats above the shops for first time buyers.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4815</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with VVWII buildings all over it, 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.</p> <p>I also strongly suggest that you consider other brownfield sites such those I have</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				outlined in Wolverley to share the housing quota which is due to Wolverley and Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO4819</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with VWWII buildings all over it, 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.</p> <p>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="#">LPPO3416</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Are sufficient brownfield sites in Wyre Forest area to accommodate the housing needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO4057</a>	Alternatives	Support	Use Parson Chain/Brownfield sites first.
	<a href="#">LPPO3563</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Redevelop housing in the town centre i.e. Worcester Street and Park Lane.
	<a href="#">LPPO4216</a>	Town centre sites	Comment	The Council need to redevelop housing within the town centre, i.e. Worcester St and Park Lane.
	<a href="#">LPPO3982</a>	Lea Castle	Support	The proposal of an alternative site is more suitable i.e. 'land on Lea Castle' area, for said developments.
	<a href="#">LPPO3991</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>I propose an alternative: Lea Castle 'Sustainable Village' using WFDC proposals for land at Lea Castle (Option A &amp; B) extended to the Wolverhampton Road/Agborough Lane as site would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. accommodate 2,000-2,500 houses</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. be large enough to build/support 2 primary schools.</li> <li>3. enhance Cookley parish facilities.</li> <li>4. be within Wolverley CE High School catchment.</li> <li>5. support its own village centre</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4008</a>	Alternative suggestions	Comment	<p>Use:</p> <p>Lea Castle site which has road systems in place/would have less impact.</p> <p>Zortech Avenue/the former golf course plus former Parsons Chain Company before Green Belt</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3104</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	<p>I would propose further development of the Lea Castle site which could provide 2000-2500 houses.</p> <p>This development would provide a small/medium sized community, which would be large enough to support a Primary School and a Bus Service. It would also be in the catchment area of Wolverley High School to give a positive impact on the school's long term viability.</p> <p>Whichever options are chosen the road network needs significant improvements to maintain safety and minimise congestion.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3101</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>I believe that the OCAG-LP group proposal for a sustainable village located at Lea Castle shows far more merit than the proposal put forward by WFDC, and request that you consider this as a viable alternative.</p> <p>In addition, I would like to see serious consideration given to the creative regeneration of the town centre, to include converting some of the unused warehouses into living accommodation.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3108</a>	6.57	Comment	I suggest not only the use of all available brownfield sites before considering any reduction of the Green Belt, also, there are many thousands of empty or derelict houses in this country, these should be renovated & put back into use.
	<a href="#">LPPO4510</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	<p>Anyone driving into Kidderminster from Stourbridge, via The Rose Theatre junction, must feel instantly depressed, it looks so awful!</p> <p>There are all the depressing closed shops. They could bring life to the town centre as housing, if they were developed into apartments and flats.</p> <p>All around Kidderminster there are Brownfield sites, standing derelict and depressing.</p> <p>There should be a time limit set for development of these sites. Again, re-vitalising the town centre.</p> <p>Kidderminster could be in the for- front of town centre revival in a new and different way. With on-line shopping, town centre shops will never be the same!</p> <p>Make the residents of Kidderminster, proud of all areas of our town and the impression which it gives to visitors.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3249</a>	Lea Castle - Sustainable Village	Support	I do support the proposal from OCAg for a Lea Castle Sustainable Village.
	<a href="#">LPPO4514</a>	Lea Castle	Comment	<p>Building on that site would not interfere with the local community or cause excessive traffic in an already built up area.</p> <p>Wolverley high school is not over subscribed so would have spaces for the new community. This would also support their long term viability</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3256</a>	Alternatives	Comment	To regenerate the Centre of Kidderminster, has any body thought of demolishing the shops from the old Woolworths downwards and building residential homes and flats to blend into the walk and shopping area.  I believe it would add to the housing shortage and also bring life back into the centre of town by attracting new business due to there presence.
	<a href="#">LPPO3507</a>	Alternatives	Comment	There are lots of brown sites not used yet before using Green Belt
	<a href="#">LPPO3264</a>	Lea Castle	Support	I believe that a better option is for the brownfield site of Lea Castle to be developed to meet Kidderminster's needs, this makes much more sense as it is close to the 449 Wolverhampton Road and the Stourbridge road, also would eliminate the need for a very expensive bypass. The development would be large enough to serve a small primary school and feed on into the secondary school at Wolverley which has the capacity to take the children.  With shops and doctors added it would become a desirable place for families to live, providing a very substantial income for the council at minimal cost.
	<a href="#">LPPO4535</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	Wouldn't it be far better to build a totally new village within the district thereby, again, giving residents what they want - access to green space all around?
	<a href="#">LPPO4188</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Look at alternative sites outside of the town on the Kidderminster side with direct access to the by pass opposite the safari park. This will at least keep the extra traffic away from passing in and out of an already busy little town.
	<a href="#">LPPO4515</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	There are large areas in Kidderminster which need redevelopment.....sion hill school site, old glades site, town centre empty units and flats above to name a few. These should be redeveloped BEFORE green sites are built on. This would prevent the town centre dying and Kidderminster being spread out thinly until it meets surrounding villages.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4620</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	I would feel the most safest route for cyclists and people wanting a footpath would be down Kendlewood Road and then on to the main Stourbridge Road and through Broadwaters and then down into Kidderminster town centre.
	<a href="#">LPPO4621</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	Some people would be better positioned on the Lea Castle site e.g those people commuting to Wolverhampton and Stourbridge daily.  There are many disused buildings and abandoned sites in Kidderminster that could be put to use before carving up the countryside. In particular, the Horsefair area has been in severe need of redevelopment since I first came to live in Kidderminster in 1972. If I was visiting Kidderminster for the first time from the Stourbridge side of town, I wouldn't bother stopping.
	<a href="#">LPPO3369</a>	6.57 Alternative sites	Object	There are alternatives, Lea Castle, the Ferndale estate, the Old magistrates court and market building, standing empty for many years. Brownfield sites first please. The old telephone exchange is a good example of using existing buildings. Now housing for nice flats. More of this sort of planning would not only be better for Kidderminster generally but would put life back into the town itself.  Let them be a role model to show that Kidderminster people and wildlife matter in these days of capitalism.
	<a href="#">LPPO3372</a>	Lea Castle - Sustainable Village	Comment	The Lea Castle Option would be the least disruptive all round and should be given very serious consideration. Create a large housing estate on the 'Lea Castle Hospital' site that has its own shops and services.
	<a href="#">LPPO4374</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Employment could be within the South Kidderminster Enterprise Zone: 'Adjacent Ceramaspeed', 'Victoria Carpets Sports Ground' and land between Hoo Farm & Summerfield and opposite Easter Park.
	<a href="#">LPPO3457</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	My preferred option is for the council to develop all the brownfield sites and disused building around Kidderminster, including revitalising the town centre,

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				before any further plans are considered. Allowance for current negotiations with Europe should be completed before any agreement regarding proposed housing requirements are made.
	<a href="#">LPPO4623</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	<p>There are many areas in Kidderminster town centre that would benefit from homes being built within them, above shops, renovating old buildings or flattening them and re-building flats, not everyone has transport so the need to stay in the town close to the bus/train station is a necessity. There are plenty of alternatives.</p> <p>We have a very beautiful town that could be made better, by making the town centre a place people will want to live and be happy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3578</a>	Selba Drive	Object	<p>This land was given to the Council on completion of the Self Build on the understanding that it would not be built on but be left as open access land for people to enjoy. To now contemplate its use for building flies in the face of that understanding. It is well used by a great many people both young and old for many purposes and should remain as such.</p> <p>A wonderful outlook, on an open aspect and where so many can enjoy themselves.</p> <p>Please register my objection against this land being used for accommodation either now or in the future.</p>
Kidderminster Golf Club	<a href="#">LPPO3162</a>	Crown house	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I fail to understand why you have not considered demolishing the Crown House/bldgs in the Bull Ring to make way for a new development.</li> <li>• Three storey flats or shops/offices could provide income for the Council in lieu of present income.</li> <li>• The building is a disgrace and does deter visitors from the town centre.</li> <li>• The exterior is dirty and detracts from other welcome developments.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4198</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	Please look at alternative sites i.e. town centre and regenerate a dying and sad town centre
	<a href="#">LPPO4239</a>	Option B	Comment	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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4825</a>	Alternatives	Object	Development of all the brownfield sites should take place before using any other land. Whilst the council have identified some brownfield sites, we take the view that there are more which should an could be considered. There is a large disused property behind Matalan (Park Lane), there is an old building, (inhabited by pigeons) opposite Aldi on Green Street and there are many empty town centre shops. The old Woolworths for example could be turned into an indoor market with small shop units on the ground floor and crate flats above.
	<a href="#">LPPO3477</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	Facilities of gas, electric and sewage, plus a foot print of a previously existing school. Would extend the long term viability of Wolverley CH High School.  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contained on one site.</li> <li>2. Less disruption to the Green Belt.</li> <li>3. Lower costs.</li> </ol>
	<a href="#">LPPO4199</a>	6.57 Extended Lea Castle	Support	We support the proposal for Lea Castle sustainable village which would allow for a community development, complete with primary school and would be capable of sustaining a bus service.
	<a href="#">LPPO4187</a>	Alternatives	Comment	We are strongly in favour of small scale sympathetic housing development at the following sites;  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The old workhouse at 64 High Street, Bewdley</li> <li>2. The existing Fire Station and surrounding land off the Load street car park</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>in Bewdley. We understand both these sites are included in the extant local plan so cannot understand why they are not included in this revised draft plan.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO5113</a></p>	<p>Alternatives</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>The Council are also suggesting the building of a multiplex cinema (again been proposed since they knocked down the original cinema) and yet more shops and restaurants in Bromsgrove Street, but they need a developer for this. Why not use the land for building low cost housing within walking distance of the town and station? That would regenerate the area more than a cinema.</p> <p>Greater vision is needed by the Council. In the report they talk about people wanting to come to Kidderminster to live. Have they actually walked round Kidderminster town centre lately? There is a vast amount of empty factories, shops, etc. that could be knocked down and used for houses. I have been here 36 years and many of the factories that were empty and derelict when we came here are still empty and derelict. Before building on Green Fields the council should look to compulsory purchase some of these premises to rebuild as living accommodation.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO5111</a></p>	<p>Alternatives</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>Serious consideration should be made in redevelopment of all Brownfield areas within Wyre Forest especially Kidderminster, where we have a lot of smaller sites within residential areas which are standing empty(some for many years) and not being used. Some Brownfield areas such as Lea Castle (again empty for years) are a larger area which could sustain a community in its self If these areas were redeveloped at least the public could see the town is being regenerated, like the Silverfields ongoing project. Although this has slowed down considerably of late....are houses actually being sold? is there the demand for the properties being built there?</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				There may not be the land area through Brownfield sites to accommodate the number of dwellings required overall but would be less impact on the environment and nature by using these previously used sites instead of Green Belt!
	<a href="#">LPPO5010</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>Kidderminster town is run down, untidy, and lacks investment. The only upside to the town is the location of Green Belt countryside that surrounds it.</p> <p>The town has numerous locations that require redevelopment that would create lots of housing opportunities which would regenerate the centre. This would surely be the better option for the town and it's people and would show that the Council are committed to building a better Kidderminster.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5119</a>	Alternatives	Comment	There a number of old unused buildings in and around the town which should be redeveloped and provide an infrastructure to support the houses before further houses are built.
	<a href="#">LPPO5126</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>Sites which are brownfield and not part of the town's natural surroundings should be built on first. The Lea Castle area will not affect Kidderminster residents the way the Spennells proposals will.</p> <p>There is also a large number of vacant properties, residential and commercial, around Kidderminster and the rest of the district.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5120</a>	Alternatives	Support	In and around the town centre there are disused building and unoccupied plots which if not built on must be subject to compulsory order in the first instance. The Crown House typifies our very poor use.
	<a href="#">LPPO5116</a>	6.57	Comment	Please reconsider with thoughts of a realist rather than an idealist. Many people commuting to Birmingham and Worcester desire to live in the country and you should work on a plan to build more villages on some green field sites outside Kidderminster to give people this option. This would disperse the concentration of

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>people entering an already grid locked system.</p> <p>Younger people prefer to live nearer town centres so housing should be provided close to or in the town centre where there is a wealth of entertainment and recreation and this could help revitalise the area. Young people do not tend to want to live on housing estates far away from all the amenities which is what you suggest in the easier option A.</p> <p>The present road between Black Bridge and Hagley should become a major dual carriageway with housing near it to rid the Worcester Road Island of its bottleneck.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4936</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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.</p> <p>I 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="#">LPPO4931</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				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.
	<a href="#">LPPO5096</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>If more housing is needed in Wyre Forest District (there is a big question mark over that presumption), then wouldn't it be far better to build a totally new village within the district thereby, again, giving residents what they want - access to green space all around?</p> <p>Just one other point, why is there no proposed development in Wolverley?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5142</a>	Alternatives	Comment	I believe there are several more suitable sites available, Lea Castle, Sion Hill old school, Forest Glades area come immediately to mind.
	<a href="#">LPPO5151</a>	Alternatives	Comment	With regard to housing development Lea Castle was identified, and we would hope this would be confined to housing, but we cannot recall mention of the use of Sladden or Sion Hill Schools as being potential development sites. There is now a substantial vacant plot in Park Lane previously occupied by timber merchants and this appeared nowhere in the proposal.
	<a href="#">LPPO5140</a>	Alternatives	Comment	A more appropriate site for development would be the derelict use Lea Castle Site which could provide a functioning village community. There are also sites within Kidderminster which could be developed such as Worcester Street, Crown House and the Old Leisure Centre area.
	<a href="#">LPPO5139</a>	Alternatives	Support	<p>Until all of the brownfield sites, of which there are many, have be used and/or considered, no building on Green Belt land should go ahead. The Green Belt is for all to enjoy for many generations to come and if it is constantly used for building projects there will be none left for future generations.</p> <p>All councils should stop looking at cost of everything and start considering the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>value of the Green Belt for everyone to enjoy.</p> <p>Look more closely at the available brownfield sites and we are sure you will find enough for the developments that are planned. This will take more time but the easy option is not always the best</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5131</a>	Alternatives	Comment	My proposal would be for Lea Castle site to be developed with the Sion Hill School being included in the development.
	<a href="#">LPPO4944</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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.</p> <p>I 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="#">LPPO4476</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This site is large enough to build beyond the existing foot print of the old hospital, therefore making it a viable proposition for a large site that could include a variety of houses, shops a school and a doctors surgery, it could also have its own bus route.</li> <li>2. The area is also isolated by tree's and wouldn't be as visible</li> <li>3. The area already has all the utilities</li> <li>4. The community at a Lea Castle site (Lea Castle Village) would be in the catchment area for Wolverley School, which secure the Schools future.</li> <li>5. We feel such a large development would promote its own vibrant, sustainable community.</li> <li>6. The Spennell's site was developed in the 70's and has proven to provide</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				housing and a community feel, could a similar development to this not be considered for Lea Castle?
	<a href="#">LPPO4545</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>I believe it would be more beneficial to make use of the brownfield sites to create more homes and to re-generate the town itself, there are several buildings which would be better utilised in this way rather than left to rot and make the town look like an eyesore. My suggestions are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The land which used to be the Glades Leisure Centre, I know there is consultation for it to become a multiplex Cinema which in an ideal world I think would be a brilliant idea, however, realistically speaking young people, families etc. do not attend cinemas as it is far too costly and with modern technology such as Sky, Virgin, Amazon firesticks etc, they can watch all they want by using these methods of viewing at a lot less cost. This is why I think this land would be of more benefit by using it for housing.</li> <li>2. All the empty shops in Worcester Steet, i.e. the old Woolworths, Littlewoods stores and the large amount of charity shops.</li> <li>3. The Old Magistrates Court.</li> <li>4. The disused timber yard and warehousing behind Matalan, this would be perfect for town houses or Apartments for canalside living similar to areas in Birmingham which have been re-generated with fantastic restaurants etc.</li> <li>5. Sion Hill School.</li> <li>6. Sladen School.</li> <li>7. The Old Lea Castle Hospital would be ideal as it has two major roads either side of it which would be able to handle the extra volume of traffic no problem, I am confident of this as I travel along these roads everyday to work and there is nowhere near as much traffic on these roads as there is</li> </ol>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>around the Spennells/Aggborough/Offmore areas. The plan to use Lea Castle would also mean using less Green Belt Land than the Spennells proposition.</p> <p>I have lived in Kidderminster for 34 years and have watched the decline of the town over a number of these years I desperately would love the council to carry on rejuvenating the town itself and make it a pleasurable place to visit with more restaurants, maybe an entertainment venue for concerts, shows etc rather than taking away our valuable Green Belt land which once gone will be gone forever.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4305</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Kidderminster Town Centre has now shifted towards Weavers Wharf Shopping Centre and therefore I cannot see that Worcester Street will ever become a vibrant shopping street again as peoples' shopping habits have changed dramatically over the last decade. All the derelict shops could be changed to town housing, flats and apartments, making it ideal for affordable housing where people will be in the heart of the town which will help local businesses enormously. This would then alleviate the "ghost" town part of Kidderminster and link up with the proposed building on the old Glades Sports Centre and the old Magistrates Court complex.</p> <p>Where the British Heart Foundation shop burnt down on New Road, Kidderminster would also be ideal for flats.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3948</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>Rather than building on land resulting in a loss of community leisure space and affecting an SSSI, why not build flats and apartments above the empty shops in the town centre or build at the rear of the Ferndale estate?</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4549</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>Is the land by Tesco in Stourport to be developed at last. Is the land on Ferndale where the Eagles Nest pub used to stand to be developed at last? How many more houses are there to be built on the Silverwoods site? What about the old school sites such as Sladen in Hurcott Road or the site on Sion Hill? There are several</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				other sites which look in need of tidying up and developing where housing would enhance the area.
	<a href="#">LPPO4307</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>I would love to see a regeneration programme that really lifts the spirits of the people of Kidderminster. Can we have proposals that would enhance the Wyre Forest and make it an area we would be proud to live in?</p> <p>In the light of the Kidderminster/Stourport link road, my vision would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• re-purposing empty units and building new units in Stourport Road area to provide retail (like Primark) and companies (like OGL).</li> <li>• look at what attracts people to the Merry Hill and include those shops in this area to encourage people to stay and shop local.</li> <li>• relocate all the warehouse companies from New Road to the Stourport Road area.</li> <li>• build all the affordable housing you require on New Road. Young people will be most attracted to this area because of its close proximity to the Railway Station and Town Centre.</li> <li>• provide affordable housing very near the town centre and railway station.</li> <li>• regenerate current town centre to provide excellent retail and attract shops.</li> <li>• more businesses with highly paid jobs</li> <li>• bungalows with beautiful views lots of generous sized rooms and a nice sized plot for well off elderly people to encourage old people to move from their family homes</li> <li>• new spacious four bedroomed houses with beautiful views, three/four reception rooms, quite large garden, definately not open plan and overlooked.</li> <li>• relieve congestion, making journeys to work easier.</li> <li>• regenerate parks that are free for people to visit.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• help schools regenerate and develop</li> <li>• help hospitals provide the best care for all local people.</li> </ul> <p>The following makes me feel sad:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• only retail, tourism and leisure jobs being provided.</li> <li>• 50% of the extra houses on the Green Belt land on the edges of town being for affordable housing that are a stepping stone to help people get on the housing ladder and not forever homes, beautiful houses/bungalows.</li> <li>• a new road near housing that will create noise and pollution.</li> <li>• turning the top of Spennells from a desirable, quiet, place to live, on the edge of town to a dreadful place to live.</li> <li>• taking away habitat for wildlife.</li> <li>• taking away free green space for Spennells’ people to visit on foot.</li> </ul> <p>Please consider creating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing within close proximity of the railway station (easy walking distance).</li> <li>• Housing within close proximity of the town centre (easy walking distance).</li> </ul> <p>With this in mind could the following be considered:</p> <p>New Road is full of shops that could be relocated (perhaps some to the vacant shops within the town centre and vacant units on the Stourport Road) and housing built on both sides of the road. This would provide housing that is near the town centre, railway station and canal.</p> <p>I also think lots of care should be taken to provide quality, free, places to go.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				Sanders Park in Bromsgrove is much nicer than any park in Kidderminster and could be used as a model for Spennells Park.
	<a href="#">LPPO3950</a>	Lea Castle	Support	Concentrate development in one area, ie Lea Castle with a shop/school so that it is independent. Cookley and Wolverley village schools are already under stress and this site has easier road access than most.
	<a href="#">LPPO3211</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	There are many derelict and empty buildings in Kidderminster town centre, and the Council should use its power and compulsory purchase orders to acquire these and make good living provisions for the elderly and young (flat type apartments) and rejuvenate the existing town centre. Use the Lion Park for 100% housing, and move the proposed cinema 'leisure complex' to another area of the town centre, rather than separating the town even further. Lea Castle site needs to be developed in its entirety and made into an urban village which would accommodate all housing needs. Any vacant houses in the area need to be bought back to use. There are currently very many vacant and 'for sale' properties in Kidderminster, and with the suggestions as above, including the review of housing numbers, there is plenty of available land for development and I cannot see any need for building or removing the Green Belt in Option A for at least 10 – 15 years, so it is the Councils duty to protect this for as long as possible.
	<a href="#">LPPO4398</a>	Alternative Sites	Comment	Use brownfield sites instead of Green Belt land
	<a href="#">LPPO4502</a>	6.57 Alternative suggestions	Comment	I suggest use of Brownfield sites/empty buildings in town first to help the smaller numbers of new residents integrate more easily.
	<a href="#">LPPO3973</a>	Pra 6.57	Comment	I feel that if extra homes really do need to be built the Lea Castle site should be developed as it is currently unused. Also Crown House could be re-developed into flats instead of being the eye-sore it is now, and the old Wyre Forest Glades site is not showing much signs of anyone being interested in developing it, so this could also be used for flats. There is also the land previously occupied by a builder's

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				merchants at the back of Matalan.
	<a href="#">LPPO4195</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Comment	<p>Extending the current Lea Castle proposed development site could provide a 'village' style community with shops and a primary school.</p> <p>This site would be much less of an impact on agricultural land</p> <p>It would be within catchment area for Wolverley High School and help to sustain the long term viability of that school.</p> <p>It would not require major new road building schemes.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4578</a>	6.57	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the Lea Castle site with additional land proposed which we believe would sustain a community of between 2000 and 2500 house, which would support a 2 form entry Primary School and would not impact on Cookley Village Centre. It would be within the catchment area of Wolverley CE High School and would positively impact on its long term viability. There are many empty sites around the Kidderminster area, i.e. Sladen School site, Sion Hill School site, the Horsefair, and land in Park Lane leading to Matalan to mention a few which could be used for housing.</li> <li>• Also the town centre needs regenerating — why not use the Crown House for flats, the top of shops in Worcester Street as flats and also use the Glades land and surrounding land for housing. Kidderminster does not need a Multi complex cinema and more shops. The cinemas in the surrounding areas are empty because of the cost of tickets.</li> </ul> <p>We believe Wyre Forest District Council are wrong not to propose any development on the North/West of Kidderminster, Bewdley or Stourport on Severn as we feel there are areas which could be developed within these</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				catchment areas.
	<a href="#">LPPO4579</a>	6.57	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop the Lea Castle site with additional land proposed which we believe would sustain a community of between 2000 and 2500 house, which would support a 2 form entry Primary School and would not impact on Cookley Village Centre. It would be within the catchment area of Wolverley CE High School and would positively impact on its long term viability. There are many empty sites around the Kidderminster area, i.e. Sladen School site, Sion Hill School site, the Horsefair, and land in Park Lane leading to Matalan to mention a few which could be used for housing.</li> <li>Also the town centre needs regenerating — why not use the Crown House for flats, the top of shops in Worcester Street as flats and also use the Glades land and surrounding land for housing. Kidderminster does not need a Multi complex cinema and more shops. The cinemas in the surrounding areas are empty because of the cost of tickets.</li> </ul> <p>We believe Wyre Forest District Council are wrong not to propose any development on the North/West of Kidderminster, Bewdley or Stourport on Severn as we feel there are areas which could be developed within these catchment areas.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3572</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Question: Why has it not been possible to develop the brownfield site – formerly Parson’s Chain. Reilloc Chain was developed almost immediately after closure?
	<a href="#">LPPO3987</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	My proposal is to extent the Lea Castle site WFR/WC/15/16/32 to include all the area between Axborough Lane, Stourbridge Road, Park Gate Road and the Wolverhampton Road. This would form a liveable village community, which should include shops, amenity for children, a Primary School and possibly a surgery and bus service. In making a self contained community its impact on Cookley would be greatly reduced and it would be in close proximity to Wolverley CE High School,

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				enhancing its long term future.
	<a href="#">LPPO3999</a>	Alternative suggestions	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of land not previously in the local plan would distribute development.</li> <li>• Development of the readily accessible Lea Castle site by combining options A plus B/Wolverhampton Road/Axborough Lane to create a community with schools/bus service would have less environmental impact and minimise loss of Green Belt.</li> <li>• The Hurcott ADR site has good road access, is isolated from other Greenfield reducing cultivation capacity and would have less environmental impact</li> <li>• developers' profit margins are not a factor</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO4002</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	Develop the Lea Castle as a small 'village' and Sion Hill school sites both currently not used
	<a href="#">LPPO4005</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	Lea Castle is a better option commercially with all necessary utilities remaining from its previous use as a hospital. The land area is trust with two point access to free flowing roads.
	<a href="#">LPPO4169</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Alternative sites for development: Area of land next to All Saints Church Wribbenhall, The land area off the B4195 Bewdley to Stourport Road opposite Cooks nursery, The field on the left coming from the roundabout into Bewdley. The area of land between New Road and the old Heath Hotel. The land opposite the Bewdley Leisure Centre is ideal the field between Blackstone Car Park and Leisure Centre. Park Lane in Kidderminster, conversion of redundant buildings at the bottom of Park Lane near to Matalan and the old Jewson Builders supply yard the old Riverboat buildings in Blackwell Street all need to be considered.
	<a href="#">LPPO4197</a>	Paragraph 6.57	Comment	As stated before there are enough Brownfield sites to build a sufficient number of houses, before looking at Greenfield sites.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3439</a>	Alternatives	Object	I cannot see why the council feels the need to develop the outskirts of Kidderminster when there is plenty of available space already vacant within the town centre. There are several empty premises that could be turned in to flats and where the infrastructure would not need to be extended.
	<a href="#">LPPO3446</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	The former Lea Castle Hospital brownfield site should be utilised first and foremost as the site already has good access and existing utility supplies.  Incorporate a two-form school, (2,000-2,500) houses, also a bus service and would support Cookley Parish.
	<a href="#">LPPO4058</a>	Alternative suggestions	Comment	An element of building could be considered in all four corners of Wolverhampton/Wolverley and Park Gate Roads. We realise that this farmland also produces food year in year but the fields are surrounded by pollution. We also concur with the advantages of the OCA's proposals.  The fields at the rear of Ferndale is farmed but it is not extending building towards the West Midlands and should sadly be considered before any development to the east of Kidderminster.  The Horsefair: we are unable to understand why the shops/houses in Blackwell Street, are still allowed to be occupied. A compulsory purchase order should become effective and the buildings demolished and the road extensively widened. 'The Peacock' is unworthy of 'listed' status and should be reviewed – resolution of daily congestion requires priority. It is an eyesore for everyone who passed thorough.  Could a compulsory purchase order on Crown House be a consideration? An apartment block, with underground and/or ground and first floor security parking,

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>could replace this neglected building.</p> <p>Are the derelict factory buildings all taking part in the review?</p> <p>If there must be building on the Offmore site – maybe Munro Close and Rosetti Close could become a crescent with the building of complex bungalows only – bus stop and show near by.</p> <p>Future building of shops and industrial units must consider energy efficiency.</p> <p>Community care in all its aspects through to hospitals. A major consideration to be taken on board.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3473</a>	Selba Drive	Object	<p>When the properties in Selba Drive were built this piece of land was left as is was deemed unsuitable due to difficult drainage . The land was gifted to the Council on condition they cleared it and maintained it for the use of the children on Habberley Estate to play on, also for other recreational pursuits including picnics, exercising dogs, ball games.</p> <p>This area is safe, away from traffic and well used by children. Dog walkers also use this space on a regular basis. It is used by lots of people from the estate for leisure activities.</p> <p>Kidderminster is beginning to become a concrete jungle! We have noted that expensive houses are springing up all over the place, and now there appears to be a panic to build more community builds. May I suggest you use the land of the now derelict Lea Castle Hospital, which would make a lovely new estate for this purpose, and meet the quantity demanded of the government, and leave Selba Drive and others in the area alone. Lea Castle has the capacity to build 800 houses or more, and as it is land that has been built on, more suitable than squeezing in a</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				few houses here and there.
	<a href="#">LPPO3978</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Object	I would suggest as an alternative to building around Offmore & Comberton, a bigger site at Lea Castle. The Plan currently proposes using some of this land in both Option A and B but I would suggest combining the land under both options and then extending the site to include land up to the Wolverhampton Road and at the rear of Lea Castle up to Axborough Lane. There might also be a possibility of further development on the western side of Wolverley Road towards Sion Hill, which would link with development at the Sion Hill School site. With this proposed land, including the sites in that vicinity already included in the Plan, a sustainable community of around 2,000-2,500 houses could be created. This would be large enough to support a 2 form entry primary school within the catchment of Wolverley High School (thus positively impacting on the school's long term viability) and a sustainable bus service. It would also support a 'village' centre within the Cookley Parish without putting a burden on that community and would potentially be able to support live-work units.
	<a href="#">LPPO4804</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	The land around Lea Castle could be more utilised to fill the complete area bordered by the A449, B4189, A451 and Axborough Lane. The field to the west and adjacent to the A449 could also be considered with suitable separation from local housing. The development could form a new village.
	<a href="#">LPPO4805</a>	Alternatives	Support	The retail land in the town centre (the Forest Glades site, old indoor market, old court house, old Woolworth building etc) should be developed in its entirety for affordable housing and accommodation for the elderly, to help regenerate the centre and remove the dereliction.
	<a href="#">LPPO4808</a>	Alternatives	Comment	The villages within Wyre Forest could be expanded to accept some of the new developments and relieve some of the pressure to use the Green Belt around the towns. This could help revitalise the villages and help their retail premises, age balance and school viability.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4801</a>	Extended Lea Castle	Support	<p>There is a perfectly viable alternative at the Lea Castle site.</p> <p>I fully support 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.</p> <p>As I understand it you are responsible for maintaining protection of the environment and for the selection of the planning sites for the 5,400 homes in the Wyre Forest that are demanded by the government. This can surely be achieved by development of Lea Castle site proposed as an alternative by the OCAG.LP.</p> <p>The Lea Castle site is also an opportunity to preserve the existing wildlife habitats and sites of scientific interest around Offmore and Baldwin Road.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5080</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>In the town centre there are so many large premises empty - the eyesore which is Crown House, and derelict Worcester street etc. With imagination and planning the town could be revitalised and used productively. The old courts, the Brintons building by the Town Hall for example are crying out for redevelopment and a second wind of growth. With so much more online business it is clear that not only in Kidderminster but nationwide, retail business will never be the same as it was 30 years ago. Scant recognition of these observations is made in the plan. Retail businesses should be downsized to reflect future demand, and the historical heritage buildings should be sympathetically developed, and there should be living accommodation built centrally based. I'm confident that if flats/small affordable housing was to be built on central town sites it would attract young professionals and entrepreneurs. The town centre would become vibrant again, with more leisure, restaurants, and tourist attractions centrally based.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5011</a>	6.57	Comment	<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</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				considered as a priority in all three Wyre Forest towns. There is the land adjacent to Tesco Stourport that has already been passed for housing and the land where Wyre Forest Golf was. It has also been brought to our attention that there is some land (No mans land and not owned by anyone) between Kidderminster and Wolverley B4190.
	<a href="#">LPPO5066</a>	Lea Castle	Comment	I understand housing has to be built for the future, but would it not be possible to use somewhere like Lea Castle Hospital grounds and use some of the facilities already there, for instance existing roads existing drainage and good access from both the Wolverhampton and Stourbridge roads
	<a href="#">LPPO5067</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>1. The Council need to build on brownfield sites and not greenfield, within the Kidderminster area.</p> <p>2. The Town Centre has developmental potential, Bromsgrove Street, Worcester Street, knock down the old Post Office building and build small apartment block, develop the old Sladen site and Sion Hill sites. Consider building in Blakedown on any brownfield sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5083</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>The aim surely should be to create better existing neighbourhoods of affordable housing for mixed income families and newcomers and not just to boost housing numbers ad hoc. Surely it would be better for Kidderminster to regenerate areas around the district where public transport systems are already established reducing car journeys for example, local businesses can prosper and new businesses see a value in setting up in the area.</p> <p>Derelict buildings such as those on Park Street have remained an eyesore for all the years we have lived in Kidderminster (27). Surely some form of housing development could be considered to improve this area of town and other brownfield/derelict sites in the district to help say first time buyers and perhaps also the towns hard-pressed businesses.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO5009</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	Kidderminster Town Centre is dead, it needs regeneration and would be more suited to future generations consequently. There are a number of large buildings, such as Woolworths, which have sat empty for far too many years, that could be refurbished into plush apartments - surely this would be a more satisfactory solution? I would whole heartedly support the regeneration option.
	<a href="#">LPPO4894</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>There are a number of buildings in Kidderminster town centre, some of them previously used as part of the carpet industry, which would lend themselves to conversion to apartments suiting both the young and the old. The Glades site should only have planning permission for residential use. Kidderminster town centre is crying out for improvement and regeneration if new businesses and economically active people are to be attracted to the area. The council should be giving incentives to developers prepared to improve and provide housing in the heart of the district, rather than the easy option of allowing Green Belt sites to be developed.</p> <p>There should also be a concentration on the development of the brownfield sites that still exist, along with the sites already granted planning permission that haven't been developed as yet, and also more effort to bring the 1,404 vacant dwellings identified in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need back into use.</p> <p>Core sites in Kidderminster proposed for allocation. The potential for 510 dwellings are identified in this list, along with some developments for mixed use, ie. housing and employment. So the potential is for far more than this figure. Also, 24.36 hectares are allocated for employment use, 15.51 hectares for housing. If the primary need in the area is for housing why not reallocate some of the land to housing rather than employment, given there are so many industrial units vacant and able to be used for industrial or office space.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4902</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Areas which should be utilised first are as follows:-</p> <p>Lea Castle site, ideal for large housing estate with good existing road access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sion Hill School site, an absolute eyesore and magnet for criminal behaviour at present, ripe for development. Easy access to junior school, on bus route and within walking distance of High School.</li> <li>• Sladen School site, ideal for low cost housing for those without own transport as within walking distance of town centre and has local convenience shops even nearer.</li> <li>• Old Market building should be utilised in some way, either converted or demolished and built on.</li> <li>• Old Leisure Centre site should not be a cinema, should again be low cost housing for those without own transport as actually in town and close to Health Centre. If a cinema is desired by the Council why not in one of the empty shops in the town centre. Might hopefully bring some life to the town.</li> <li>• Old cricket ground at bottom of Chester Road South, again has good road access.</li> <li>• Old warehouse adjacent to Matalan could be turned into flats with car park on ground floor for residents.</li> </ul> <p>All these sites and others, should be utilised first before even considering ravaging our Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4903</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Every attempt should be made to build on the known Brownfield sites, Lea castle; Sladen School, Sion Hill thus spreading the impact on traffic density. There are many more available sites in Kidderminster and surrounding areas that should be developed first.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>There are large areas next to the New Leisure Centre that are lying vacant at the moment.</p> <p>The ex leisure centre site could be built on with affordable housing instead of a cinema, put that on the site of the burnt down building next to Iceland and near the Library. This would bring a bit of life back into the centre of the town, rather than on the fringes as the leisure centre site is.</p> <p>More effort needs to be put into reviving the town centre instead of unneeded housing. The local population has remained fairly static, where is the need for 600 houses? Unless we are to become an over spill town for Birmingham!!</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5104</a>	Alternatives	Comment	<p>The resultant requirement of around 3600 dwellings should be built on the identified brownfield sites in the Plan; on the previously developed land in the Green Belt; and on the whole of the Lea Castle site.</p> <p>Expand the scope of the Plan to include Blakedown, Wolverley and Chaddesley Corbett.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4841</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>The 'either/or' question is constraining without reason. It strikes me that development at the Lea Castle Hospital and adjoining areas could answer pressures on the infrastructure. This would include parts of Options A and B and the red core with what appears to be relatively easy access to major roads. I would be concerned about the intensity of this concentrated development without detailed analysis of its impact on the environment, infrastructure and traffic congestion. Again I am not convinced that there is a need for the extent of this development within the Wyre Forest District.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5114</a>	6.57	Comment	<p>Please reconsider with thoughts of a realist rather than an idealist. Many people commuting to Birmingham and Worcester desire to live in the country and you should work on a plan to build more villages on some green field sites outside</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				<p>Kidderminster to give people this option. This would disperse the concentration of people entering an already grid locked system.</p> <p>Younger people prefer to live nearer town centres so housing should be provided close to or in the town centre where there is a wealth of entertainment and recreation and this could help revitalise the area. Young people do not tend to want to live on housing estates far away from all the amenities which is what you suggest in the easier option A.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4925</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>Maximise the use of brownfield land in Wyre Forest. There are so many unused buildings in the area, including Kidderminster town centre, which is totally under used and feels almost derelict. The development of the old Glades site should be used for housing rather than a cinema. If the empty town centre sites were developed for housing then this may give renewed life to the centre and provide more people who would rely on the central and local businesses. New houses will be unaffordable for younger people and young families. Not all home-owners require houses and back gardens. Flats near to facilities can be a great starter home and a stepping stone onto the property ladder for younger residents. They can also provide homes for the older generation who are unable to use their own transport to travel into the town centre. The Council should also concentrate on developing on Lea Castle and making it a viable village. This can also provide housing and a community in one area without having to develop on greenfield sites and take away good farming land.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4940</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	<p>There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				I 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.
	<a href="#">LPPO5145</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Referred to the Horsefair and building 300 new homes - suggested this as a more appropriate site, especially with the regeneration of Kidderminster Town and its railway station ideal for commuting.
	<a href="#">LPPO4848</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	Has Kidderminster Town Centre been properly considered? Town centres all over the country are dying because of changes in the way we live and purchase goods. In any case Kidderminster is well served with two modern shopping areas, Weavers Wharf and Carpet Trades, leaving much of the original town centre a shabby run down area, comprising charity shops, pop-up shops and the ubiquitous mobile phone stores, which no amount of dressing up will improve. Why not creatively re-design the town centre and rebuild it as an innovative 21st century example of a vibrant and exciting urban living area. This will be a more expensive option than building houses on fields, but if developed properly would be held up as an example throughout the UK, putting Kidderminster well and truly on the map.
	<a href="#">LPPO4886</a>	6.57 Alternatives	Comment	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are brownfield sites that are not even on the plan, for example Brown Westhead Park in Wolverley (former army hospital with WWII buildings all over it, 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> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO PARAGRAPH 6.57**

Company / Organisation	ID	Part of Document	Type of Response-	Summary of Response
				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.
	<a href="#">LPPO4799</a>	6.57 Extended Lea Castle	Comment	There is a more viable option available at the former Lea Castle Hospital site which does form part of the plan review but also lends itself to even more capacity by extending that site to include land bordering the A449 Wolverhampton Road and Axborough Lane. This option would create a sustainable village community whilst at the same time provide the capacity needed for future housing quotas. It is an existing brownfield site with very large potential and has capacity to include local shop/public house, GP surgery, school and the like. Giving it a sustainable village model that will not have a great impact upon the surrounding or immediate locality
	<a href="#">LPPO5133</a>	Alternatives	Comment	Reduce the number of empty properties by charging their owners extra council tax giving them a deadline date for when charging to start.  Suggest buildings are adapted to living in, or indoor market.
	<a href="#">LPPO4910</a>	6.57 Extended Lea Castle	Comment	Support Lea Castle site for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A sustainable community could inc 2,000-2,500 (include affordable) houses with schools, shops and community/social support</li> <li>• Easy direct access to major roads yo minimise congestion.</li> </ul>
	<a href="#">LPPO5130</a>	6.57	Comment	A 'ready made' site at Lea Castle – so use it.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO695</a>	Policy 7	Comment	<u>Policy 7 and 31</u> — We agree with the notion that the Green Belt has not been reviewed, in WFDC since the 1970s and note WFDC acknowledges that previously developed land alone will not be sufficient to meet the growth requirements of the district. This policy draft states that the Spatial Strategy seeks to minimise impact on the Green Belt. Minimal impact would be better achieved as discussed above, by removing a larger volume of smaller sites across the district rather than a smaller number of large sites which will have greater impact. This would better contain development and prevent urban sprawl in larger volumes in more limited areas which is in conflict with the requirements of the Green Belt as outlined in the NPPF	Comments are noted. However, we have to ensure the allocation of sites are in sustainable locations. The allocation of large extension sites enables services to be provided on site if sufficient local services are not available nearby. The Sustainability Appraisal sets out the alternative options that have been considered.
Homes England	<a href="#">LPPO804</a>	Policy 7	Comment	Policy proposes amendments to the Green Belt boundaries to enable sustainable urban extensions around Kidderminster. The HCA supports the proposals to removal of the Lea Castle Hospital site from the Green Belt. Whilst this is a previously developed site within the Green Belt, it is considered to be logical to amend the boundary at this location, removing the site from the Green Belt to enable its re-development.	Support of Lea Castle site redevelopment is noted.
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	<a href="#">LPPO935</a>	Policy 7	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First paragraph - See comments (in relation to Policy 25) and the incompatibility with NPPF.</li> <li>• Amend paragraph 3: In accordance with paragraph <del>82-83</del> of the National Planning Policy Framework. (NPPF Para 82 refers to the creation of new Green Belt)</li> </ul>	Agree with suggested changes to paragraph 3. The Kidderminster Harriers proposed relocation site will need further consideration as the emerging Local Plan progresses.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide clarity to the plan - amend paragraph 3 to make clear that the review of the Green Belt is to exclude land from it, rather than expand Green Belt in these locations.</li> <li>To provide clarity to the plan and support for the new sports facility in this location. Add to bullet 2: Minor changes to the Green Belt boundary will also be made at southern Kidderminster <b>to allow the development of a centre of sporting excellence including sports facilities and related development</b>, Stourport on Severn and Bewdley to enable local development needs to be met most sustainably and economically.</li> </ul>	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1054</a>	Policy 7	Comment	This policy seems to offer an appropriate way forward though we reiterate our position that the Green Belt release to the east of Kidderminster should be more limited than that proposed by Option A. In this regard we note that Option B has a reduced impact on Green Belt (by area) which is welcome and would be broadly in line with the Government's stated position on Green Belt release.	Comments are noted.
National Farmers Union West Midlands Region	<a href="#">LPPO1118</a>	Policy 7	Comment	We welcome the support for affordable housing on rural exception sites in the Green Belt. This policy should also make a specific reference to the need for agricultural and diversified businesses to develop within the Green Belt. Even if the support for businesses in these areas is implied elsewhere within	Support and comments are noted. The NPPF para 89 already provides an exception in Green Belt Policy for the construction of agricultural buildings as follows:

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				the document, it ought to be more stridently expressed within this section of the plan. We would like to see a can do attitude to development that recognises that farming businesses have an essential role in maintaining the local landscape by grazing livestock, maintaining hedgerows and participating in agri-environment schemes.	"A local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:  Buildings for agricultural and forestry."
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1152</a>	Policy 7 - ADRs	Comment	The three Areas of Development Restraint (ADRs) in the Wolverley & Cookley Parish (Land off Hayes Road, Wolverley, Land off Lowe Lane, Wolverley and Land off Kimberlee Avenue, Cookley) should be retained and safeguarded and not be used for Housing Development.	Comments are noted.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1498</a>	Policy 7	Comment	Releasing land from the Green Belt to deliver sustainable growth, are endorsed  Kidderminster most sustainable location for growth is enveloped by Green Belt. Brownfield sites are diminishing or difficult to bring forward for development. Green Belt release is necessary to support sustainable growth and to ensure identified issues and objectives are met within the plan period.  Land at Rectory Lane, Areley Kings is not within the Green Belt and should be prioritised as an allocation through the Local Plan Review.  Do not support the approach set out in respect of	Comments are noted.  As per NPPF para 89, there will be 'safeguarded' sites allocated which will enable future development to come forward if required at the next Local Plan Review.  The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) sets out the alternative options for development.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Areas of Development Restraint within the District.</p> <p>Local Plan needs to consider future development needs within the District beyond the proposed Plan period (2034). NPPF paragraph 85 states that ‘safeguarded land’ should be identified in order to meet longer term development needs <b>stretching well beyond the plan period</b></p> <p>In determining the appropriate quantum of safeguarded land to identify within Wyre Forest District it is necessary to consider the local context, including: the opportunities for meeting longer term development needs outside of the Green Belt beyond the plan period; and, the likely level of future housing and employment that will be required to meet the needs of the District beyond the plan period including cross boundary pressures.</p> <p>In the longer-term Kidderminster will need to retain a key role in providing new homes to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the District, including identified needs for affordable homes. Necessary to release land from the Green Belt in the longer term to ensure future needs can be met and the vitality of services and facilities can be maximised in the longer term.</p> <p>In addition, the supporting settlement of Stourport-on-Severn will also retain a key role in providing new</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>homes to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of the District, including identified needs for affordable homes.</p> <p>Whilst the draft Local Plan proposes to roll forward safeguarded land at Stourport on-Severn and a number of villages, this level and location of provision is ineffective in ensuring long term development needs can be met and Green Belt boundaries will endure in the long term.</p> <p>To ensure Kidderminster continues to play an important role in meeting longer term housing needs and to ensure an enduring Green Belt boundary beyond the plan period, safeguarded land should be identified around Kidderminster within this Local Plan.</p>	
Stanmore Properties Ltd	<a href="#">LPP01511</a>	Policy 7	Comment	Strategic Green Belt review is necessary having regard to the amount of housing required. The more detailed Second Stage Green Belt Study (AMEC 2017) is welcomed.	Comments are noted.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01595</a>	Policy 7	Comment	Need to consider the extent of need in the District and that the right locations for growth have been selected so can make an informed assessment of how much Green Belt land release is required. Failure to do so will result in an unsound strategy which does not balance the need for housing with the appropriate quantum of housing sites.	Comments and support for the Catchems Ends site are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation of the Local Plan (Para 83 NPPF) The Council recognises that exceptional circumstances are justified through the need to facilitate the development that is needed and promote sustainable patterns of development.</p> <p>Locations for growth that are integrated into the built form of the town of Bewdley should be looked at that provide a reasonable prospect for housing. Development to the north, south and west of the town should be limited due to topography which would give rise to prominent developments with significant landscape impacts. Land at Catchems End is an appropriate location for Green Belt release however, as identified in response to the Council’s Development Options, RPS considers that the Council needs to provide more certainty that this site can come forward, further to release from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Greater consideration should be given to land to the east of the town, south of existing development at Catchems End. This land is of a lower landscape value and could be developed in a way to integrate with the existing development and enhance the sustainability of the area. It is considered that this release would be necessary in order to meet the requirements of the strategy under the test of exceptional circumstances, expressed in paragraph 83 of the NPPF.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response						
				<p>The Wyre Forest Green Belt Review Part II Site Analysis (2017) reviews Catchems End (referred to as site WA/BE/3) against to 5 principles of the Green Belt identified in Paragraph 80 of the NPPF. The Council’s assessment indicates is that the site makes a significant contribution towards three of the five Green Belt purposes. RPS does not agree with the Council’s evidence and considers that the analysis of the site is flawed and that amendments should be made as set out in the table below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="893 699 1559 1353"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="893 699 1111 775">Green Belt Purpose</th> <th data-bbox="1111 699 1337 775">Council Analysis</th> <th data-bbox="1337 699 1559 775">RPS Analysis</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="893 775 1111 1353"><b>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</b></td> <td data-bbox="1111 775 1337 1353"><b>Contribution</b> Whilst the site is relatively small and well bounded, it does make a contribution to preventing local sprawl along the Kidderminster Road and the A456.</td> <td data-bbox="1337 775 1559 1353"><b>Limited Contribution</b> The site is well bounded by the west midlands safari park, Bewdley and Wribbenhall and does not contribute towards preventing local sprawl as the site is surrounded by other uses.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Green Belt Purpose	Council Analysis	RPS Analysis	<b>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</b>	<b>Contribution</b> Whilst the site is relatively small and well bounded, it does make a contribution to preventing local sprawl along the Kidderminster Road and the A456.	<b>Limited Contribution</b> The site is well bounded by the west midlands safari park, Bewdley and Wribbenhall and does not contribute towards preventing local sprawl as the site is surrounded by other uses.	
Green Belt Purpose	Council Analysis	RPS Analysis									
<b>To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</b>	<b>Contribution</b> Whilst the site is relatively small and well bounded, it does make a contribution to preventing local sprawl along the Kidderminster Road and the A456.	<b>Limited Contribution</b> The site is well bounded by the west midlands safari park, Bewdley and Wribbenhall and does not contribute towards preventing local sprawl as the site is surrounded by other uses.									

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response			WFDC Officer Response
				<p><b>To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Contribution</b> The site is part of land which separates Bewdley, Kidderminster and Stourport and is judged to make a significant contribution to this purpose, albeit bounded by the A456.</p>	<p><b>Limited Contribution</b> The site does not contribute to separating the settlements as the West Midlands Safari park lies between the site and Kidderminster with Wribbenhall to the south which separates the settlement from Stourport.</p>	
				<p><b>To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</b></p>	<p><b>Contribution</b> The site is contained on its northern and southern sides, although the western boundary is less clear.</p>	<p><b>Limited Contribution</b> The site is well contained on all sides with the West Midlands Safari Park to the west.</p>	
				<p><b>To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</b></p>	<p><b>Significant Contribution As</b> part of the north eastern gateway</p>	<p><b>Limited Contribution</b> The site does not contribute to the</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response			WFDC Officer Response
					into Bewdley, the site makes a significant contribution, although there is no visual connection with the heart of the town.	historic setting of Bewdley with very little in the way of historic assets within the area. There is no connection between the historic centre of Bewdley and the location of the site. The open space will also enhance the historic setting of a small number of listed buildings within the area.	
				<b>Overall Assessment of Contribution to Green Belt Purposes</b>	<b>Significant Contribution</b> Overall, and cumulatively, the site makes a significant contribution to Green Belt purposes because of its role as part of the wider tract	<b>Limited Contribution</b> Overall the site makes a limited contribution towards the Green Belt as it is well bounded by existing uses around the site. Namely, the	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response			
				<table border="1" data-bbox="898 300 1552 1023"> <tr> <td data-bbox="898 300 1111 1023"></td> <td data-bbox="1111 300 1339 1023">of land separating Bewdley, Stourport and Kidderminster, its role as part of the gateway to Bewdley, a role in preventing wider encroachment and sprawl. Development would reduce openness by bringing the edge of Bewdley south eastwards to meet the A456, although this would act as a long-term edge.</td> <td data-bbox="1339 300 1552 1023">West Midlands Safari Park to the west and Wribbenhall to the south. This ensures that the site does not contribute towards restricted urban sprawl, restricting development in the countryside and the separation with Stourport or Kidderminster.</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="898 1023 1552 1394">Land at Catchems End can be released from the Green Belt without undermining the functions of the Green Belt and its role in preventing urban sprawl. The site is located adjacent to the A456, currently screened from the road by an unbroken hedgerow, interspersed with trees. Though this site is currently within the Green Belt, it does not fulfil the current functions of the Green Belt and could be released without giving rise to significant effects or risk of setting precedent. It</p>		of land separating Bewdley, Stourport and Kidderminster, its role as part of the gateway to Bewdley, a role in preventing wider encroachment and sprawl. Development would reduce openness by bringing the edge of Bewdley south eastwards to meet the A456, although this would act as a long-term edge.	West Midlands Safari Park to the west and Wribbenhall to the south. This ensures that the site does not contribute towards restricted urban sprawl, restricting development in the countryside and the separation with Stourport or Kidderminster.	
	of land separating Bewdley, Stourport and Kidderminster, its role as part of the gateway to Bewdley, a role in preventing wider encroachment and sprawl. Development would reduce openness by bringing the edge of Bewdley south eastwards to meet the A456, although this would act as a long-term edge.	West Midlands Safari Park to the west and Wribbenhall to the south. This ensures that the site does not contribute towards restricted urban sprawl, restricting development in the countryside and the separation with Stourport or Kidderminster.						

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				is considered that Land at Kidderminster Road represents a realistic site for delivery and should be included within the Local Plan as a site for Green Belt release.	
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPP01651</a>	Policy 7	Comment	Given the lack of otherwise identified sites in the Fairfield and Wolverley areas, we do not support Hayes Road being given ADR status. Rather, we would want to see Hayes Road treated as an exception site, which would enable the site to be more fully developed as an affordable housing scheme.	The Hayes Road site was allocated as an ADR site in a previously adopted Local Plan.
	<a href="#">LPP02316</a>	Cookley Green Belt	Comment	<p>"Insetting" and "washed over" status of 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 to Broadwaters, 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>Cookley is referred to as Inset Green Belt. How will Cookley be Inset Green Belt when the southern Green Belt is completely removed? Your intention is to join Cookley to Kidderminster, therefore negating your obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt.</p>	Disagree. Cookley village is separate from the Lea Castle site and will remain as a separate village.
	<a href="#">LPP04607</a>	Policy 7	Comment	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	Disagree. Cookley village is separate from the Lea Castle site and will remain as a separate village.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>allow for development to meet local needs.” How is a development of so many homes joining Cookley at the northern end, to Broadwaters, Kidderminster at the southern end, 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 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.</p> <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, and forming a development large enough to join Cookley to Kidderminster.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO655</a>	Green Belt	Object	<p>I object to the concept of development in any Green Belt land. When population is clearly out of control, the idea of just building to solve the problem is short sighted. If this is the plan for the near future, then what about beyond? Will more Green Belt be taken to answer the problem then, until there is not green</p>	<p>Objections noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				space at all?	<p>housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Future Local Plans may also require Green Belt release if the housing need cannot be accommodated on land not in the Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO661</a>	Cookley ADR	Object	<p>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</li> </ul>	<p>Objection is noted. The ADR sites listed in Policy 7 are already allocated as ADR sites in the current adopted Local Plan.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				is brown field.	
Hagley Parish Council	<a href="#">LPP0776</a>	Policy 7	Object	Green Belt Review - NPPF says that the Green Belt Boundaries should only be reviewed in “exceptional circumstances”, which it does not explain further. The Housing White Paper, which is presumably relevant as emerging government policy, indicates that this means boundaries should be changed only when all other options have been considered. In other words, changing Green Belt Boundaries should be a last resort. Neither the Consultation Document nor any of the background research that we have seen provides any explanation of why this last resort needs even to be considered.	<p>The NPPF in para 83 states “Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.” Wyre Forest District Council is undertaking a ‘Local Plan Review’ so this meets the requirements set out in para 83 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) forms part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan and will set out the alternative options that have been considered and why Green Belt release is necessary.</p>
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0934</a>	Policy 7	Object	<p>Current text does not make clear the 5 purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Green Belt boundaries can only be altered by a Local Plan Review and in exceptional circumstances. NPPG says meeting housing numbers on its own is not 'exceptional circumstances'. Housing White Paper is consulting on adding explanation that review should only be done if all other options have been considered. Plan fails to establish if this has been done. We</p>	<p>The NPPF in para 83 states “Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through the preparation or review of the Local Plan.” Wyre Forest District Council is undertaking a ‘Local Plan Review’ so this meets the requirements set out in para 83 of the NPPF.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>challenge assumption that there is not enough housing land without using Green Belt land. Sites in Bewdley and Stourport to west of River Severn are outside of Green Belt. Option to use such sites should be explored prior to reviewing Green Belt.</p> <p>One objective of Green Belt is to stop towns coalescing. For this purpose, Cookley should be included. Concerned that release of Hurcott ADR and development of hospital site will lead to joining up of Kidderminster and Cookley and urban sprawl. However, leaving hospital site as derelict is not an option.</p>	The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) forms part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan and will set out the alternative options that have been considered and why Green Belt release is necessary.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1428</a>	Policy 7	Object	<p><u>Support</u> Green Belt boundary review. <u>Object</u> to the time period used for the Green Belt review.</p> <p>In order to accommodate longer term development needs a date of 2051 should be used to assess future development needs. This timeframe will allow land to be released now which could be used for development in the next two Local Plan reviews, providing a long term Green Belt boundary whilst allowing all parties to plan positively for the future of the district as well as accommodating future overspill from the Black Country and Birmingham conurbations.</p>	The NPPF para 157 states that Local Plans should “be drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15-year time horizon, take account of longer term requirements, and be kept up to date.” The emerging Local Plan will be for a 20 year plan period which is typical of the time period used in most adopted Local Plans. As per NPPF para 89, there will be ‘safeguarded’ sites allocated which will enable future development to come forward if required at the next Local Plan Review.
	<a href="#">LPPO2313</a>	Policy 7	Object	Policy 7 - It says it all in the opening sentence. It is therefore your job to produce a) Accurate figures and then b) Justify the reasons why Green Belt should be	Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>built on when you haven't worked hard enough to get current brownfield sites built on.</p>	<p>meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3648</a></p>	<p>Policy 7</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Concerned about the proposals at Wilden Top Area of Development Restraint (ADR). We would like to object to and express concern about the proposals in the LPRPO document, June 2017, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include the site as a potential site for Travelling Showpeople</li> <li>• Continue to include the site as an ADR for the development of housing</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the substantial impact upon the rural and unspoilt nature of Bigbury Lane we have the following major concerns about the proposed development:</p> <p><b><u>B: Concerns Relating to the Continuation of the Site as an ADR</u></b></p> <p><b>B1: It is anticipated that the development of new</b></p>	<p>Objection and comments are noted.</p> <p>The site was allocated as an ADR site in the currently adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><b>housing would destroy the character of the area and could detract from local heritage assets.</b></p> <p>It is anticipated that a housing development at the top of Bigbury Lane would not integrate effectively with its surroundings as it would destroy the rural, wooded character of the lane, substantially increase the housing density, destroy the existing layout and detract from the setting of heritage assets. Two locally listed buildings are located adjacent to the base of the site. It is anticipated that any housing development would completely destroy current design and layout and substantially increase the density of housing and would be unlikely to blend with the locally listed buildings and rural character of the lane. The ADR borders onto the fence of a private residential dwelling and, I assume, would transform the landscape adjacent to this locally listed Mock Tudor building.</p> <p>Section 11.18 of the LPRPO states that <i>“the benefits of conserving and enhancing heritage assets include: ..influencing the character of an area and giving it a sense of place”</i>. Policy 11C states that <i>“new development must protect and where possible enhance the unique character of the landscape including the individual settlement or hamlet within which it is located”</i>. Policy 11D states that development should <i>“support the conservation, enhancement and restoration of biodiversity and geodiversity across the Plan Area”</i>. It is hoped that this rationale would be</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>applied to any proposed development at Wilden Top if any development is permitted.</p> <p>Section 32.3 of the LPRPO states that the <i>“land at Burlish Crossing is near the Lickhill Road North sites and would require extensive planting along the northern boundary to soften the impact of built development as viewed from the Bewdley direction”</i>. If a new housing site or site for Travelling Showpeople was approved for the Wilden Top site would the same conditions be made upon imposed on any new development?</p> <p>There are numerous references in the Baker Report detailing why the site at Wilden Top would be unsuitable as a site for Travelling Showpeople. It states that <i>“mitigation would be required to protect the character of the lane regard should be had for the footpath”</i>. I assume that most of these would also apply to any proposed housing development?</p> <p><b>B2.The site may not be well served by facilities.</b></p> <p>The Local Plan Review Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal Report states that all of the Stourport sites <i>“score well in terms of access to services apart from the sites at Wilden Top and Sandy Lane”</i> which are not served well by facilities. Appendix G6 continues that the site scores negatively in relation to other criteria. I assume that these scorings apply both to the continuation as an ADR or a site for Travelling</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Showpeople. It is assumed that these issues could potentially make the site unsuitable for either type of development?</p> <p>Since the closure of Wilden Lane Post Office last year there is no longer a local shop to serve any new housing development. There may be issues relating to power supply and sewerage for any new development at the Wilden Top ADR. I am concerned that any new housing development would further exacerbate the frequent interruptions to the electricity supply experienced by residents of Bigbury Lane. The sewers in this area are narrower than modern sewers and thus more prone to blockage. I don't know whether or not this would affect any housing development further up the hill.</p> <p><b><u>C: Concerns Relating to Both Proposals</u></b></p> <p>As far as I am aware , unlike the other sites included in the LPRPO it does not include an indicative number of dwellings for the ADR at Wilden Top or for the number of pitches proposed for a site for Travelling Showpeople, which makes it difficult to comment on the scale of the impact of the proposals. The number of dwellings or pitches proposed would obviously affect the scale of the impact of any development on the local area. Is it possible to provide this information? The Baker Report, Appendix 4, 2011, states that availability of the site "is currently unknown" - I assume</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>that this is still the case as there appear to be no references in the document to the owners wishing to sell/ make available the land.</p> <p>The Planning Team should walk around the site before proceeding any further with this proposal as, in light of the points above, we cannot understand why this site is being considered as a potential site for Travelling Showpeople or retained as an ADR.</p> <p><b>C1. Any additional pedestrian footfall must substantially increase the risks to pedestrian safety on Bigbury Lane due to the narrowness of some sections of the lane and absence of a footpath along the majority of the lane. These risks would also be substantially increased by wide vehicles attempting to pass pedestrians on narrow sections of the lane where there is no footpath.</b></p> <p>Bigbury Lane is a narrow lane and is not suitable for any additional pedestrian traffic. One section is particularly narrow and bendy and is located on a hill, which can encourage traffic travelling downhill to gather speed. The creation of either a housing site (or a site for Travelling Showpeople) could potentially result in increased pedestrian footfall to the base of Bigbury Lane and could lead to major pedestrian/road traffic incidents. Although I imagine that any plans to create housing in the ADR at the top of Wilden Lane could include the creation of a footpath alongside such</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>housing I cannot envisage how the lower section of Bigbury Lane could be made safe for pedestrians.</p> <p>Problems occur when motorists try to travel either up or down the Lane and encounter a vehicle travelling in the opposite direction. Cars often have to wait and sometimes pull onto the drive of private properties, in order to pass oncoming traffic. This can be further complicated by pedestrians trying to negotiate a safe route along the Lane, which must present a significant risk to pedestrian safety. Any increase to the footfall along this section of the Lane would, in my view, substantially increase this risk.</p> <p>At present I think most of the pedestrians from the housing estate at the top of the hill travel down Bigbury Lane.</p> <p>It has been suggested by a Local Councillor that some of the residents of the housing estate at the top of the hill, use Wilden Top Lane to access Hartlebury Road or use the public footpath that leads to the community centre to access Wilden Lane. I have visited this footpath and would like to invite other representatives of WFDC to do the same. The path includes several sections which have a very steep gradient, one section has many steps which would not be accessible for anyone using a buggy or pushchair or for many older people. Therefore I believe that existing and additional pedestrians are most likely to use Bigbury Lane to</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>access Wilden Lane. Some residents will not feel safe using an off road public footpath especially in the dark whereas Bigbury Lane has street lights. The top section of Hillary Road and majority of Wilden Top Lane do not have streetlights which, I expect, would encourage further pedestrian footfall along Bigbury Lane from any new development at Wilden Top when it is the dark.</p> <p>I think many people will understandably have to weigh up the risks between walking down an isolated footpath (with a steep gradient but with no traffic) to walking down a busy narrow lane with no footpath.</p> <p>Bigbury Lane is also frequently used by horse riders, which can add to the risk from traffic and pedestrians trying to pass in narrow sections of the lane.</p> <p>Any significant housing development in the Wilden Top ADR, even if it included the provision of a footpath in that section of the Lane, would substantially further reduce road safety along the lower section of Bigbury Lane where there is no footpath. This is particularly important given the high volume of young families that walk down the lane to access Wilden Primary School, older children who access the bus route to Stourport High School, and workers who walk to bus routes and the main road via Wilden Lane.</p> <p><b>C2. Destruction of the natural environment and the impact upon local wildlife, particularly some</b></p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><b>protected species including the local bat population.</b></p> <p>It is expected that the development of any new housing would completely destroy the habitat of resident wildlife and a site for Travelling Showpeople, to a slightly lesser extent, could destroy the habitat of and displace local wildlife.</p> <p>This piece of land has been allowed to grow wild for a significant period. Any development, either a site for Travelling Showpeople or a housing development could destroy local wildlife, which may include protected species.</p> <p>The land located at Wilden Top was taken out of the Green Belt in 1989 and designated as an Area of Developmental Restraint and this designation has not been adjusted since then. However as this action was taken 18 years ago I believe that there is significant reason to review this decision.</p> <p>During the last 18 years the land in question and the surrounding land, at the top and middle of Bigbury Lane, must have matured further and I believe that the site is now home to a broad spectrum of wildlife. I believe that before any plan for housing or for the creation of a site for Travelling Showpeople is approved an independent bat survey and a full wildlife survey should be undertaken in order to assess the potential impact of any development upon the environment,</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>particularly any protected species of wildlife nesting and living within this site.</p> <p>Bats have been observed frequently in the gardens of the houses immediately below the proposed site at Wilden Top. Without a thorough independent survey there is a major risk that substantially changing the nature of the Wilden Top site either as a housing development or a site for Travelling Showpeople could risk breaking the law if it causes “<i>damage or destroy a breeding or resting place</i>” or “<i>obstruct access to their resting or sheltering places</i>” .</p> <p><b>C3. Exacerbation of existing congestion issues in Bigbury Lane.</b></p> <p>Difficulties are frequently experienced in passing oncoming traffic and in parking, particularly in the middle and lower sections of Bigbury Lane. This would be made much worse by the increased volume of traffic that would accompany a new housing development but would also be exacerbated by any additional traffic, particularly wide vehicles.</p> <p>Bigbury Lane already suffers from major congestion and a lack of adequate parking spaces. There is not sufficient room for visitors to residential properties to park.</p> <p>Passing vehicles frequently have to pull over to allow</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>traffic to pass, either in the stopping places or sometimes onto the edge of private driveways in order to pass oncoming vehicles, often causing tailbacks.</p> <p>Increased congestion and parking issues also increases the risks to pedestrian safety as pedestrians have to navigate between and around vehicles without a suitable footpath.</p> <p>Any additional proposed housing development must increase the number of vehicles and pedestrians using the lane exacerbate parking issues and thereby further increase the risks to pedestrian safety. Would it be responsible to propose a development at Wilden Top that would create these problems, particularly as it could pose a threat to public safety by encouraging and increasing pedestrian footfall in this steep narrow lane, mostly without a footpath, used by many families and other pedestrians to access the local school and Wilden Lane.?</p> <p><b><u>Conclusion</u></b></p> <p>In the light of the information above we would like to object to the proposals for the site at Widen Top to either create a site for Travelling Showpeople or to continue to allocate the site as an Area of Development Restraint. Due to the number and gravity of our concerns my neighbour and I would appreciate the opportunity to meet representatives of Wyre Forest</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				District Council at or adjacent to the site to discuss our concerns and how, or if, they can be addressed before any of these proposals are included in the next version of the Proposed Local Plan.	
	<a href="#">LPPO26</a>	Use of Green Belt	Object	<p>Objects to use of Green Belt Land:</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>• 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> </ul> <p>I urge you not to make use of Green Belt land for the above reasons.</p>	Objections noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO4049</a>	Policy 7	Object	<i>“Green Belt boundaries should be amended only in exceptional circumstances when local authorities can</i>	The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) provides details of the alternative

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><i>demonstrate that they have fully examined all other reasonable options for meeting their identified housing requirements</i>". WFDC have not met this criteria and reference two documents AMEC 2016 and AMEC 2017 which are not accessible.</p> <p>There appears to have been no discussion with Wychavon with regard to any housing development as is proposed by the White paper.</p> <p>The Green Belt changes in relation to Stourport are all to the North —West of the town and include house density building which is much higher than normal for this region. The choice of small Green Belt sites with high density building will exacerbate the already overloaded transport and education facilities in that area. No mention is made 01: use of the land south of Kingsway (Previously, also Wyre Forest Golf Club) which would provide a housing area similar to or larger than two of the proposed core sites and with access to schools and transport.</p>	<p>options that have been considered in the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The Green Belt Study produced by AMEC was available during the consultation period for public viewing. Copies were available to download on the Council website and hardcopies were available at the 8 drop-in sessions held throughout the District for public viewing.</p> <p>We have consulted with Wychavon District Council and continue to do so as part of our Duty-to-Cooperate requirements.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4604</a>	Green Belt	Object	<p>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</p>	<p>Disagree. Cookley village is separate from the Lea Castle site and will remain as a separate village.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>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.</p> <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 and without the destruction of the woodland.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO4958</a>	Cookley ADR	Object	<p>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.</p> <p>The options A&amp;B in addition to the red area is too much for surrounding villages/areas to sustain. More definition needs to be revealed as to infrastructure</p>	Objection and comments are noted. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan sets out the infrastructure plans for the Local Plan period.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				going in place, schools, GP's shops etc.	
	<a href="#">LPP04960</a>	Cookley ADR	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.	Objection is noted.
Horton Estates Ltd	<a href="#">LPP0852</a>	Policy 7	Support	We support the reference to development proposals in the Green Belt being assessed against relevant national planning policy. However, this policy should accord with, and cross-refer to, draft Policy 34 which permits certain forms of development at PDL sites in the Green Belt. In addition, we wish to highlight that PDL within the Green Belt could be released at Cursley Distribution Park through site rationalisation which could be allocated for residential development. This site lies within Parcel SE4 of the Strategic Green Belt Review (Strategic Analysis, Amec, 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 could be released (1.5ha and 1.9ha), each of which could accommodate in the order of 40 dwellings. This would require the land to be released from the Green Belt and reflected in Policy 7.	Support for Policy 7 noted. Cross-reference to Policy 34 will be considered.  Comments regarding Cursley Distribution Park site are noted.
Miller Homes	<a href="#">LPP0951</a>	Policy 7	Support	Our client <b>supports</b> the proposal to allocate the	Comments and issues raised are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Hurcott Area of Development Restraint (ADR) (land between A451 and Hurcott Village) for residential development.</p> <p>The Preferred Options consultation document highlights that the availability of previously developed sites within the District is insufficient to accommodate the higher objectively assessed housing need (OAHN) based requirement for the District. Furthermore WFDC reporting identifies a total availability of 2,956 dwellings based on a combination of completions (April 2016-April 2017), existing and lapsed planning permissions, previously developed land (Green Belt) and previously developed land (non Green Belt) against an OAHN target of 5,400 dwellings and a Local Plan target of 6,000 dwellings. This represents shortfalls of 2,444 and 3,044 dwellings respectively. Therefore greenfield sites need to be identified and allocated to enable the residual requirement to be met.</p> <p>As identified in our client’s response to proposed Policy 6C, the Local Plan Review Preferred Options consultation document also identifies that <i>“the urban areas of the District have the greatest housing needs and are the locations where the cost of public service delivery is relatively low”</i>. The WFDC Settlement Hierarchy Technical Paper proposes that Kidderminster is classified as a Strategic Centre at the top of the District settlement hierarchy, and accordingly is</p>	<p>Agree that the ADR site has already been removed from the Green Belt, however Green Belt restrictions remain in place as it is safeguarded land.</p> <p>There are ecological issues in the southern area of this site as the ADR site backs onto an SSSI.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>considered to be the most sustainable settlement in the District and the main focus for future development within the District. It is noted that this proposed settlement hierarchy formed the basis for both the current adopted Core Strategy Policy DS01 and proposed Policy 6B of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>It stands to reason therefore that the development need that cannot be met on previously developed land should be focussed on the settlements higher up in the settlement hierarchy, especially to greenfield sites on the edge of Kidderminster, as advocated by proposed Policy 6C of the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that local planning authorities can, where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period.</p> <p>Kidderminster is surrounded by Green Belt, with the exception of one ADR, between the A451 and Hurcott Village, Kidderminster. The land within this ADR was removed from the Green Belt and designated as ADR through the Wyre Forest Urban Areas Local Plan (1989) in order to meet longer term development requirements. Whilst WFDC has been able to adopt subsequent Development Plan Documents without requiring incursions into the Green Belt or requiring</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>the development of ADRs to meet development needs, the time has come for WFDC to look beyond the boundaries of its urban areas for sites to meet the District’s development needs.</p> <p>As a non Green Belt site which has already been identified for meeting longer term development needs, the ADR between the A451 and Hurcott Village presents the most logical and most sequentially preferable first option for accommodating residential development adjacent to the most sustainable settlement in the District. Moreover the development of this site reduces the amount of land required to be removed from the Green Belt through the new Local Plan to meet the District’s development needs.</p> <p>Although the site is not located within the Green Belt, this area of ADR is assessed within the WFDC Green Belt Review Part II – Site Analysis report as if it was in the Green Belt. The site is assessed in two parts. With respect to the northern area the reporting states that <i>“Development of the site would not significantly damage Green Belt function in this location”</i>. The report does also comment that the development of both the northern and southern areas would reduce the openness of these areas. The report does however continue to propose both sites for development.</p> <p>This ADR has previously been assessed in the 2009 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>(SHLAA), which reports that the SHLAA panel considered that the 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.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) for the Preferred Options consultation document highlights the positive implications of housing coming forward on this ADR site, 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 this ADR, which is pending determination. This planning application, submitted by a national housebuilder (our client), provides further demonstration of market confidence in this location,</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>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.</p> <p>In terms of the location of this site, 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.</p> <p>In addition, extensive technical assessment has been undertaken with respect of the northern area of the ADR in relation to ecology, drainage, transport, noise, landscape, agricultural land quality, ground quality, sustainability, archaeology and trees. The site is of limited archaeological interest. The ecological features of most interest are located around the boundaries of the site, 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.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>There are limited views into this site and the impact of development on the landscape can be further reduced through enhanced boundary planting.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If the northern area of the ADR is developed first, it can be developed in a way that would not compromise the ability for the rest of the ADR to be developed at a later date. The wider ADR 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 the ADR 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>	
Moor Park Trustees	<a href="#">LPPO1101</a>	Policy 7	Support	We fully support commitment to Green Belt Review through the plan preparation process. It is fully	Support and comments are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>acknowledged that this will enable development to be brought forward in a number of sustainable locations that would otherwise be constrained from growth without compromising too heavily the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.</p> <p>A development of this size will clearly bring with it social and economic benefits and would be directly required to provide educational and employment sites which is an advantage over smaller developments. It is noted that any proposals would be required to take account of existing constraints.</p> <p>Removing large volumes of Green Belt in less areas would, clearly, have a greater impact than smaller sites around the district however it is considered in the case of the East of Kidderminster (N) a large scale proposal will bring additional on-site benefits for future occupiers to assist in removing pressure of existing services in the area (schools, convenience stores, employment opportunities etc.) and contribute to a sustainable form of development to assist in accommodating the housing and employment needed in the plan period.</p>	
South Worcestershire Authorities	<a href="#">LPP01250</a>	Four Acres Caravan Park ADR	Support	The SWCs welcome that the ADR site continues to be safeguarded during the plan period.	Comments are noted.
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPP01347</a>	Policy 7	Support	Gladman support the Council's commitment to Green Belt Review through its plan preparation process. This will allow for sites to be brought forward for	Support for Policy 7 and comments are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>development alongside settlements that may otherwise be significantly constrained from growth. The approach to identifying locations for growth should also fully consider how sustainable development options can be brought forward through the Local Plan to meet the needs of settlements in locations that are not constrained by the Green Belt in reaching a decision on the circumstances relevant to the removal of land from Green Belt.</p> <p>Gladman welcome that the Green Belt Review acknowledges that the development needs of the area will need to be balanced against other factors, which together could constitute ‘exceptional circumstances’ meriting the removal of the Green Belt designation from areas of land to allow for development. Further consideration should also be given to the Framework’s expectation that regard should be given within Green Belt reviews to the intended permanence of Green Belt boundaries in the long term, so that they are capable of enduring beyond a plan period. As such, consideration should be given through up-to-date evidence to the need to identify additional or alternative areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the end date of the Plan.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO299</a>	7	Support	Support for Section 7.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3806</a>	Paragraph	Object	I object to the Council’s development strategy and	Objection is noted. It is a legal

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		7.1		<p>policy of changing the Green Belt boundaries in contradiction to its original purpose. There is no evidence of how sustainability will be achieved without creating a new town on the outskirts of the existing town that will do nothing to support the run down town centre.</p> <p>The same policy should apply to villages and other settlements.</p>	<p>requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) sets out the alternative options that have been considered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3625</a>	7.1	Object	<p>7.1 -Paragraph 82 of the N.P.P.F states that a number of changes will be made to the Green Belt boundaries, I oppose using any aspects of the Green Belt for future development, especially land off Kimberley Avenue and any developments on the north of Kidderminster or the eastern edge.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					<p>will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Note that the ADR site 'Land off Kimberlee Avenue' in Cookley has already been removed from the Green Belt as it was allocated as an ADR in a previously adopted Local Plan.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO448</a>	7	Object	<p>I object to any use of any greenfield sites until a complete use of brownfield and infill has been exhausted.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3809</a>	Paragraph 7.3	Object	<p>I object to the Council's development strategy and do not understand some of the terminology which should not be used for a document for public consultation.</p> <p>For this reason I wish to complain to the Council on grounds of maladministration. The consultation has been badly managed and designed specifically to</p>	<p>Objection is noted. 'Washed over' means the settlement is completely covered by Green Belt policy.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				prevent the public being able to understand it. It should be re-run at a time that avoids the main public holidays and no settlement should receive favouritism or protection on the issue development for the next 18 years.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3810</a>	Paragraph 7.5	Object	I object to the Council's strategy for development; the perceived need is based upon flawed analysis and is unjustified so, there is no need to remove more land from the Green Belt.	Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO4481</a>	7.5	Object	I would question this aspect as it has not been clearly evidenced why you need to remove land from the Green Belt.	Objection is noted. There is not enough deliverable brownfield land to accommodate all of our housing need in the District. Therefore, we must look at using Greenfield sites, some of which are in the Green Belt. There will be further evidence published at Pre-Submission stage.
	<a href="#">LPPO489</a>	7.5	Object	Object to para 7.5.	Objection is noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01140</a>	7.6	Comment	The plan states that "minor changes to Green Belt boundaries may be appropriate to meet local needs or aspirations and to facilitate local and neighbourhood planning in the future". As national policy requires exceptional circumstances to justify alterations to Green Belt boundaries, and that Green Belt boundaries should be set for the plan period, we question whether local needs would be sufficient. As currently phrased this could result in both uncertainty and false expectations for local communities.	Comments noted. Agree that amendments to the text should be made.
	<a href="#">LPP03811</a>	7.6	Object	I object to this statement and the Council's strategy for development which is not supported by independent analysis. The statement is contradictory and shows that the Council does not believe that the Green Belt is important.	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP03627</a>	7.6	Object	<p>Development should not be considered around Cookley apart from a small portion on the blue print on the existing Lea Castle site. We already have a stretched and dangerous infrastructure and our facilities and services are already stretched to the maximum capacity.</p> <p>Cookley housing needs are for 33 affordable rented homes, I cannot therefore see the justification for option A 150 homes, option B 360 homes and an outlined planning application for an additional 600 dwellings, this would obviously mean building away from the blue print of existing buildings. We also need to take into account the bat population at Lea Castle.</p>	Objection is noted. Please note that the proposed 600 dwellings on the Lea Castle site is on Brownfield land. Development at the Lea Castle site would be kept separate from Cookley Village and would not merge into one. Infrastructure requirements are being considered alongside the emerging Local Plan in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Ecology issues on site are also being considered which includes the bat population on site.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4723</a>	7.7	Comment	<p><b>7.7</b> Although I understand the reason why WFDC is now looking at Green Belt land and is to be applauded for concentrating on brownfield sites please can the plan give some regard to the fact that local, national and world circumstances change very quickly and assumptions made now will be out of date next year. The Brexit debate is one example. How many Kidderminster residents who are EU citizens will leave the area after Brexit?</p> <p>Once Green Belt land is gone it can never be replaced so Councillors and their Officers need to be sure that they are taking the right decisions with the right evidence</p>	Comments and issues raised are noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3628</a>	7.7	Object	7.7 Yes I agree that a Green Belt review needs to be carried out and included on the updated Local Plan, however I believe that it should remain the same.	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3630</a>	7.7 ii	Object	7.7.ii - I commend you on being successful in utilising previously developed land and urge you to exhaust all these avenues first for future developments, I do not believe however that some of your ideas would be limited strategic adjustments to Green Belt boundary. I would see these as being damaging to our beautiful countryside and wildlife.	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3812</a>	7.7	Object	I object to the Council's development strategy and this statement. It is not 'entirely appropriate' nor 'necessary' for the reasons I have supplied elsewhere. The perceived need is based on flawed analysis and is	Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				unjustified. Thus there is no need to remove more land from the Green Belt.	Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPP0258</a>	7.7	Object	<p>We walk on the footpaths that cross the Green Belt land identified as Option A in your plan. We are surprised and dismayed that this important Green Belt area is being considered for housing. We appreciate that the local council is under pressure from both government targets and a desire to provide housing, however, the council should be under similar pressure to protect the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Spennells estate is already large, those people have a rightful expectation to retain the access to the countryside. It seems short sighted to us to allow this valuable area to be degraded.</p> <p>In addition to our environmental concerns these fields are productive farm land and it is hard to see any reason which justifies the loss of such an area.</p>	Objection is noted.
Summerfield Against Land	<a href="#">LPP01619</a>	Green Belt	Comment	We are not anti-housing, rather we think that brownfield/urban development is a desirable and	Comments are noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Transformation		Review		<p>practical alternative strategy.</p> <p>We accept the need for housing but reject the use of Green Belt land in favour of brownfield sites and in this regard, require the Council to show more ingenuity and to resist developer preference for 'easy sites'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We challenge the validity of the Green Belt review and question the way its findings are used to promote and legitimise both options, but especially Option A. Both options require an unacceptable incursion into the Green Belt which we challenge and reject.</li> <li>• The Study’s objectives 1 and 3 indicate the presumption on the part of the Council to use Green Belt for development purposes. This clearly goes to motive in advance of the review rather than development need arising from the review.</li> <li>• There is some confusion as to the number of dwellings to be built on Green Belt Land.</li> <li>• Given its centrality to both Option A and Option B, the fact that there has been no public information or discussion of this prior to the publication of your draft Local Plan, effectively it is a <i>fait accompli</i>.</li> <li>• Attention is drawn to the role and value of the Green Belt yet assert the need for an eastern “Urban Extension”. “The essential characteristic of Green Belt is their</li> </ul>	<p>have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.</p> <p>The Green Belt Study has been undertaken by Consultants that have done a number of these studies and therefore very experienced at undertaking Green Belt Reviews.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>permanence and their protection must be maintained., to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green Belt is our environment and something that we should nurture and pass on, intact, to future generations. Yes, there is a need for housing but we must also consider the quality of life for existing residents. Once the Green Belt has gone it is lost forever.</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2542</a>	Green Belt Review	Object	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. The planners have been misled by an independent report and need to review the Local Plan based on this being a SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION and breach of planning guidance.	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3813</a>	7.8	Object	I object to the Council’s development strategy, the analysis is flawed and biased to suit the Councils siloed drive to develop.	Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO3814</a>	7.9	Object	I object to the Council’s development strategy, the analysis is flawed and biased to suit the Councils drive to develop. Green Belt is not manufactured, once it has gone it cannot be reapplied.	Objection and comments are noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO405</a>	7	Comment	See summary LPPO400.	Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO428</a>	7	Comment	I object to Option A and Option B.  Green Belt land should be used only as a VERY LAST RESORT.  Wyre Forest, Greater Birmingham, Solihull and Worcestershire should collaborate and collectively review overall brown field site availability and plan	Objection is noted. It is a legal requirement for the Local Authority to have an up to date Local Plan that meets the identified housing need. The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs (OAHN) Report sets out what our housing need is for the District. Unfortunately, we do not have enough

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>housing development accordingly – decisions to build on the Green Belt should not be based on local authority boundaries.</p> <p>The 5 year rolling time frame for construction sites should allow for regular reviews of brown field sites and enable changes to be incorporated into any plan,.</p> <p>The plan fails to recognise changes in shopping habits and unrealistically targets retail expansion and comparison shopping.</p> <p>Kidderminster has suffered from the failure to 'tidy up 'following the migration of Kidderminster town centre to Weavers Wharf and Crossley Retail Park.</p> <p>Retail premises and the courts building have been empty for 8 /9 years - the regeneration of such sites require radical solutions for alternative use that reduce any need to build on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Unnecessary decisions are being taken now e.g. in 1999 who could have predicted the impacts of the 2007/08 economic collapse or changes caused by online shopping (indeed, the plan itself demonstrates an inability to predict /understand short term population levels in the District).</p> <p>The plan fails in its stated aim to "to use a robust and up-to-date evidence base to ensure that the local plan</p>	<p>deliverable brownfield sites left in the District. We therefore have to release some greenfield sites to be able to meet our housing requirements. This will include some greenfield sites within the Green Belt.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area" . Instead it aims to justify what developers want to deliver rather than meet the needs of Kidderminster residents.</p> <p>Previous attempts to build an Eastern relief road have failed - the plan fails to present evidence based data that supports it in economic or environmental terms - at the consultation session I was informed this would be a single carriageway 40 mph road following the same route as the existing road from the Worcester Road through Mustow Green to the Birmingham Road - is it really a relief road at all?</p> <p>Whilst constructing a new school in the Spennells area appears attractive this (together with the promise of the 'relief road' shouldn't be the determining factor when opting to build on the Green Belt – other options should be sought.</p> <p>Many people commute into / and out of Kidderminster now (hence the railway station development) - and have done so for many years. This situation equally relates to the areas covered by the LEPs identified in the plan.</p> <p>Whilst economic development in Kidderminster will be welcome - past experience shows this will take time –</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>in the meantime people will continue to travel.</p> <p>Immediate need is for fresh radical thinking that optimises the use of brown field sites throughout the LEP areas for residential use and enables Kidderminster itself to become a modern, contained and attractive town centre that incorporates retail leisure and residential opportunities rather than pursue outdated models from the past - 'mixed use' communicates little other than the elements of 'wishful thinking' so often reported in the local press over numerous years.</p>	
Save the Green Belt Surrounding Villages in North Worcestershire	<a href="#">LPPO680</a>	Green Belt	Comment	<p>Save the Green Belt surrounding villages in North Worcestershire Wyre Forest District Council has stated the aim of its Local Plan Review is to "make sure the right development happens in the right places". However the planning maps show a disproportionate and aggressive housing development that will mean that the villages of Cookley, Hurcott and Stone will be joined onto the nearby town of Kidderminster. There is a need for housing development, shared throughout the Wyre Forest district, but providing that need by destroying Green Belt and annexing villages to the town of Kidderminster, is not a sustainable or proportionate way to do this. North Worcestershire is a green and pleasant landscape, with a mix of towns and villages. It is your duty to make sure it remains so and not to sacrifice the Green Belt leaving an urban sprawl as a legacy for future generations.</p> <p>Save the Green Belt online petition received. Contains</p>	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				1773 signatures which are local, national and international.	
Rushock Parish Council	<a href="#">LPP01104</a>	Green Belt	Comment	We are concerned about the proposed erosion of the Green Belt.	Comments noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01139</a>	Policy 7	Comment	The third and fourth bullet points set out the ADRs that are allocated or safeguarded, but neither the policy nor the reasoned justification explain why it is appropriate to allocate the Hurcott ADR.	Comments noted.
Kidderminster Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP01169</a>	Use of Green Belt	Comment	Accepts that some Green Belt will be lost, but expect this to be kept to a minimum, so that the remaining Green Belt area between settlements will ensure and support local distinction in the Wyre Forest district.	Comments noted.
Stourport on Severn Town Council	<a href="#">LPP01258</a>	Green Belt release	Comment	STC considers it unnecessary to extend into the Green Belt when there are a number of Core sites in the town which should be given priority.	Comments are noted.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPP01402</a>	Green Belt	Comment	Much of the Green Belt land is used for productive farming activity which should be maintained and enhanced on ecologically sustainable principles rather than destroyed.	Comments are noted.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPP01473</a>	Green Belt	Comment	The purpose of Green Belt is to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Check unrestricted urban sprawl.</b> The “Option A” proposal would increase the boundaries of Kidderminster extensively, while development</li> </ul>	Comments are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>under “Option B” would still have a more dispersed effect upon a range of town boundaries.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <b>Prevent neighbouring towns from merging.</b> The development adjacent to Spennells would mean that Spennells would merge with Summerfield and Stone, thus losing their separate identities.</li> <li>3. <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>4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.</li> <li>5. <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> </ol> <p>In designating the Wyre Forest as Green Belt, the following benefits have been seen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population.</li> <li>2. Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas.</li> <li>3. The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live.</li> </ol>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				4. Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns. 5. The securing of nature conservation interests. 6. The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.	
	<a href="#">LPPQ2164</a>	Green Belt	Comment	A detailed response received regarding the proposed development to the east of Kidderminster. A summary of this response is listed below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents are demonstrating/opposing development in these Green Belt areas, in part, as they enjoy using the immediate countryside on the east of Kidderminster for walks, running, cycling, even driving into and out of the area via scenic countryside. Any development should retain these elements by the planning that is granted specifically stating developments are of a low-medium density. Fields can still exist between pockets of development. The dwellings in these pockets of development should reflect, to a certain degree, buildings found in rural areas.</li> <li>• Green Belt land should always come with extremely strict planning that is appropriate to the area.</li> <li>• Regarding the scenic countryside along major roads in and out of Kidderminster. Planning could prevent development immediately</li> </ul>	Comments are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>adjacent to the main roads in and out of Wyre Forest so that the ‘image’ of scenic countryside in and out of the area is not compromised. Please do not underestimate the importance of this to an individual’s view of an area and their daily commute. I have friends from outside the area that complement the rural feel of Kidderminster due to these scenic routes in and out of the town.</p>	
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4582</a></p>	<p>Green Belt</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>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.” It also states that that the Plan will endeavour to maintain the identity and integrity of individual settlements and check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. 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 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</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Agree that Cookley Village does have its own identity and this should be preserved. Proposals in the emerging Local Plan will not merge Cookley into Lea Castle or northern Kidderminster. The separation of Cookley Village from these areas will be protected. However, development in the Green Belt does need to happen as there are not enough deliverable brownfield sites to accommodate the future housing requirement. The emerging Local Plan seeks to locate future development in sustainable locations.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>obligation to protect Cookley as a village Inset Green Belt.</p> <p>Its seems that the reason the WFDC is putting forward Option A is that if the development is sufficiently large enough i.e. over 1000 houses then this could warrant additional infrastructure, roads, doctors, schools etc. which wouldn't be forthcoming for a smaller development. So in order to support this massive development, effectively an extension of Kidderminster, we need to decimate the Green Belt and the identity and integrity of the individual settlement of Cookley be taken away. The whole point of living in a village is that it has its own identity, its own parish council, facilities and sense of belonging. We do not want this taken away from us by the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up area and we definitely want to keep our Green Belt which prevents this from happening.</p> <p>It appears that Wolverley is 'washed over' for some reason which is not made clear. Why is Wolverley washed over? It is the sister village of Cookley and Caunsall with the same Parish Council so should be treated equally. Both inset in Green Belt. With sensitive building on these Brownfield sites together with the same on the Lea Castle site I am sure we would meet the needs of our village and deliver our quota of housing proportionately to the rest of Wyre Forest.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				Cookley is a Village INSET in Green Belt. It has its own strong identity and provides key local services.	
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO773</a>	Policy 7	Object	<p>Policy 7 incorrectly interprets requirements of the Framework. Paragraph 83 confirms that once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in “exceptional circumstances”. The policy provides no guidance on how the exceptional circumstances test has to be considered in the preparation of the emerging plan.</p> <p>The policy refers to Paragraph 82 of the NPPF. This provides guidance on new Green Belts. Reference should be made to Paragraph 83.</p>	Comments noted and amendments to be actioned.
	<a href="#">LPPO1079</a>	Policy 7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 scale of development around Cookley (1200-1400) does not meet the needs of Cookley as a village. Our village envelope will be stretched to Kidderminster and our Green Belt will be decimated.</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	The intention is not to join Cookley to Kidderminster. Future development at Lea Castle would create a stand alone settlement with its own services and local facilities. The former hospital site within Lea Castle is a brownfield site. The development would therefore be making good use of a previously developed site in the Green Belt.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				a village Inset Green Belt.	
	<a href="#">LPP01587</a>	Green Belt	Object	<p>Preferred Option sites OC/5 (Husum Way) and WFR/CB/7 (Land off Birmingham Road), to the east of Kidderminster in the parish of Blakedown and Churchill. This is all Green Belt.</p> <p>The Preferred Options is generally based on the outsourced Amec Foster Wheeler (AFW) Green Belt Review Reports. Seeking to designate the Green Belt as having a “Significant Contribution” (SC), “Contribution” (C) or “Limited Contribution” (LC). The AFW comments generally are very subjective and contain factual inaccuracies such as lack of countryside views to the surroundings.</p> <p>Nonetheless, OC/5 is stated as having designations of SC in the protection against “sprawl”, C for “encroachment” and an “overall” rating of C. Strangely, they gave a classification of LC with regards to “merger”. In addition, the AFW report gave an assessment of ‘none’ against the Green Belt preserving the setting of the character of villages and other settlements in relation to our position, which is opposed to their SC designation for protection against sprawl.</p> <p><b>National Planning Policy Framework</b></p> <p>It is considered the salient sections of the NPPF relating to loss of Green Belt land when considering the Preferred Options to the Local Plan by WFDC are: The purpose of Green Belt includes to assist in safeguarding</p>	Objection is noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>the countryside from encroachment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserving the setting and character of villages and other settlements.</li> <li>• Assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the re-cycling of derelict and other urban land.</li> <li>• Avoiding taking out of Green Belt prime agricultural land.</li> </ul> <p>From the north passing to the east and south will be housing development culminating in a massive loss of at least 266 ha. of Green Belt land.</p> <p>The Preferred Options are contrary to the aims and objectives of both Wyre Forest’s stated planning objectives and those of the NPPF. The concentrated loss of good quality Green Belt land is unacceptable.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO3682</a>	Section 7	Object	Green Belt; by constantly eroding the Green Belt Wyre Forest is in danger of destroying the main reason why people come to Wyre Forest. Once gone it can never be returned and the impacts will be realised by our children when it is too late. Kidderminster will be turned into a soulless commuter town such as Redditch – which has been destroyed and lost its character and distinctiveness.	Comments are noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO4114</a>	7 Green Belt	Object	All brown field sites should be used for housing before any green field site is made available - we would be taking our children's heritage if fields were built on.	Brownfield sites have been considered as part of the proposed site allocations. However, there are not enough

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 7: STRATEGIC GREEN BELT REVIEW**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				They cannot be regained.	deliverable brownfield sites to accommodate the housing need for the District.
Bournewood Nurseries	<a href="#">LPP01962</a>	Green Belt Review	Support	<p>We fully support commitment to Green Belt Review through its plan preparation process. It is fully acknowledged that this will enable development to be brought forward in a number of sustainable locations that would otherwise be constrained from growth without compromising too heavily the purposes of including land within the Green Belt.</p> <p>Removal of any site from the Green Belt will have some impact but the perceived impact could be minimised (across the district) by removing a larger volume of smaller sites rather than a smaller number of large sites which will have greater impact in their respective locations. This would better contain development and prevent urban sprawl in larger volumes which is in conflict with the requirements of the Green Belt as outlined in the NPPF. It is felt preferable that release of smaller sites across the area would reduce the impact on the Green Belt, and its purpose as a spatial planning tool, by allowing small growth parcels instead of larger volumes with great impact.</p>	Support and comments are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
Homes England	<a href="#">LPP0805</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	<p>Policy requires average of 35 dwellings per hectare on new greenfield sites. Important that the Council's density requirements are flexible, particularly on peripheral greenfield/Green Belt sites where a lower density may be more appropriate or in cases where a particular type or size of housing is required. Density required for developments should be determined on individual circumstances of a site and as part of a masterplanning exercise that takes into account site specific constraints and also opportunities for higher density development such as close to public transport routes and facilities.</p> <p>The provision of an indicative mix for market and affordable dwellings is welcomed, but it must be recognised that this is indicative only as it could change considerably throughout the plan period.</p>	<p>We will follow the NPPF guidance regarding density on sites.</p> <p>The policy states that an average density of 35dph will be sought for Greenfield sites, although densities should reflect the density of surrounding areas. Where site specific policies are proposed, specific densities will be considered in accordance with masterplanning principles.</p> <p>The threshold and mix for affordable and market housing will be based on evidence from within the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs/ Housing Market Assessment and Viability work which is updated on a regular basis.</p>
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPP0827</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	<p>Neighbourhood Plan consultation responses show that starter, low cost market and affordable 1 &amp; 2 bed dwellings are most needed followed by housing specifically for the elderly. Young people are leaving town due to lack of affordable housing.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
Miller Homes	<a href="#">LPP0962</a>	Policy 8A	Object	<p><b>Object</b> to the suggested housing mix within Policy 8A.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires 1 Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups</p>	<p>The split proposed is between types of affordable housing e.g. the ratio of rented to low cost home ownership. This is based on income data and housing costs for Wyre Forest. The OAHN follows the guidance for determining housing needs as laid out in guidance available at the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>in the community, as well as identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing that is required in particular locations, reflecting local demand. To inform the Local Plan, the NPPF also requires2 LPAs to prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA).</p> <p>The latest Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN) report for the District3 includes a suggested dwelling mix for market and affordable dwellings based on a review of the current stock profile for the District, general household preferences (from household survey data) and affordable requirements and notes that this has been carried forward into the body of proposed Policy 8A.</p> <p>It is not clear from the OAHN report : (i) why dwelling size data has been split based on assuming a 66.6% market and 33.3% affordable apportionment given that both existing and emerging Wyre Forest District Council (WFDC) affordable housing policy seeks affordable housing provision on new developments of 30%; (ii) why the use of household survey data on dwelling stock occupancy is appropriate for forecasting the future housing mix for the District; and (iii) how the proposed separate dwelling size apportionment for market and affordable dwellings was worked out.</p> <p>The NPPF4 makes it clear that each local planning authority should ensure that their Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence. With so</p>	<p>time and will be updated to reflect changes in the NPPF and PPG.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>much uncertainty behind how the suggested housing mix figures taken from the OAHN report have been derived, and how it should be applied, our client questions the appropriateness for including a housing mix within the body of the policy wording, even if it is badged as only being a suggested mix.</p> <p>Support the inclusion within the policy wording of the requirement for new housing developments to: be well designed; address local housing needs; incorporate a range of different types, tenures and sizes of housing to create mixed communities; and for the make up of individual developments and their design and density to be in sympathy with the development context and existing neighbouring development.</p> <p>However to provide the flexibility that house builders require, suggest that this policy wording could be expanded to allow the housing mix to be considered on a site by site basis to reflect not only the location and context of the site, giving regard to the latest SHMA or other up to date OAHN assessment reporting, but also to take account of demographic trends, market trends, the needs of the community and viability considerations, to allow house builders to continue viably building and selling houses.</p> <p>This is therefore not suggesting that the suggested dwelling mix taken from the OAHN report should be ignored, but it may be more appropriate for this to be</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				included within the supporting text justification for the Policy as an example of the latest evidence base reporting position rather than in the body of the Policy wording. The OAHN figures are more useful we suggest, as part of a wider evidence base underpinning the housing mix proposed when sites actually come forward, reflecting adequate, up to date and relevant sources.	
Moor Park Trustees	<a href="#">LPPO1103</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	Policies should not seek to rigidly apply generic district wide housing mix and density requirements but be relatively flexible in order to be responsive to matters such as the individual characteristics of sites and evidence, independently verified or reviewed if required, from the market at the time of application. One of the key elements for such sites is that they are deliverable and sustainable.	Comments noted.
Rentplus	<a href="#">LPPO1108</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	<p>This policy should seek to maximise the delivery of affordable housing appropriate to its context; delivering housing that meets local needs, and aspirations whilst integrating with the wider community and contributing to the delivery of mixed neighbourhoods. We recommend the following amendment to set this out more clearly:</p> <p><i>“New housing developments must be well designed and address local housing needs <u>and aspirations</u>, incorporating a range of different types, tenures and sizes of housing to create mixed communities.”</i></p> <p>This is important because the full range of affordable</p>	Comments noted. We will support the provision of a range of affordable housing types on sites but the most acute need within Wyre Forest is for households who are unable to afford anything other than social rent so we will work with Registered Providers and Developers to meet our identified housing need.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				housing models, including rent to buy offer a new, more widely accessible route to home ownership than those models already explicitly defined in the NPPF. We have responded to the White Paper consultation, setting out that rent to buy is not an intermediate tenure, but should be defined separately to take into account its unique characteristics. As rent to buy homes are rented at an affordable rent for a defined period (in the case of the Rentplus model for 5 year-periods of 5, 10, 15 or 20 years), during which the property is managed by a partner Registered Provider and tenants are able to save towards full purchase of that home. This tenure enables aspirant households with no savings, and thus no access to a mortgage for a shared ownership or open market property, to save for full purchase within an affordable rented property. As these households do not have to move home to purchase, this also provides them with stability and contributes to developing successful places by enabling greater integration of households within their community.	
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	<a href="#">LPP01205</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	Why is table 8.0.1 based upon a 33.3% affordable split, when policy 8B talks about a policy requirement for 30%?	This refers to the split between different types of affordable housing product not the percentage that is affordable units on open market sites (30%).
West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium	<a href="#">LPP01334</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	We support what has been written, but it would remain useful to have a note in the Policy stating that density and housing mix will be determined with reference to identified local needs and viability.	Densities of housing site will be determined through a response to the character and nature of the surrounding locality.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1348</a>	Policy 8A	Object	Gladman are of the view that planning policies should not seek to rigidly apply generic district wide housing mix and density requirements. Any such policies should be suitably flexible in order to be responsive to matters such as the individual characteristics of sites, viability and changes to the market conditions over time. In this regard, Gladman would highlight that Table 8.0.1 provides an indication of district wide need at a fixed point in time based on analysis undertaken by Amion in 2016/17	Agree that housing densities should reflect surrounding area. Site specific policies, where large enough, will look at densities as part of a masterplanning process.
Stanmore Properties Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO1512</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	The policy states it is anticipated that new greenfield developments will have an average density of 35 dwellings per hectare. This does not appear to be followed through to the number of dwellings allocated on Core Housing Site South of Stourbridge Road (including Hurcott ADR) (BW/4) which 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 ( $13.80 - 35\% = 8.97 \times 35\text{dph}$ ).	Comments noted.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1515</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	Policy overly prescriptive given that in different locations there may be an excessive amount of a particular dwelling size and, therefore, any new proposal should not be constrained from delivering an appropriate mix to achieve a better balance overall. Further, the annual base dwellings is incorrect as it specifies that the affordable proportions will achieve 100 dwellings and 200 market dwellings. This is inconsistent with the	Comments noted. Policy will be amended to ensure consistency of figures throughout the document. Please see the Affordable Housing SPD for more information on determining the mix on a site specific basis.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>development requirements set out in Policy 6A, which requires 90 affordable and 210 market dwellings.</p> <p>Average density requirement consistent with the NPPF however, there should be some flexibility to reflect local character, may be at a lower/ higher density.</p>	
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPP01654</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	<p>Group's records, as demonstrated by Homes Choice Plus, indicates a slightly higher need for 3 + bedroomed homes. In consideration of this data, we would recommend that the mix of homes proposed in the Local Plan Review Document is reviewed and restated with an increased number of 3+ bedroomed homes.</p> <p>Please also see comments made by West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium.</p>	The Amion report uses data from HC+ after certain household types have been removed (e.g. those seeking shared ownership and transfers) so the percentages will appear different. This is to ensure we only consider the housing needs of those in the greatest need.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01554</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	<p>Not clear in the policy where the required need for 35 dwellings per hectare for Greenfield has been derived from and so this figure is unjustified. The Council is required to justify this figure using the most up to date evidence that is available.</p>	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPP03633</a>	Policy 8A	Object	<p>New housing developments should be made from eco friendly materials and be more gentle on our landscape and be run on renewable self sufficient energy.</p>	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPP03819</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	<p>Stourport, like most of Wyre Forest has a population structure skewed to +65 age group. However, whilst there is concern in the plan with providing affordable housing, this is to the detriment of the requirements for</p>	Comments noted. The updated OAHN will include further details on household requirements and we understand that Homes England will publish more

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>a mixed housing stock and one which addresses the down-sizing needs of retirement and ageing. The plan makes poor consideration of ‘future-proofing’ house designs, mix or adaptability, through policy guidance in the document, or through requirements for masterplans, action plans or details required at outline. To offer the alternatives to +65’s of ‘institutions’ or ‘a bungalow’ is derisory and dismissive of aspirations of older people as well as defining new developments without recognition of social/age mix/future needs or technologies. Sustainability can be delivered by all communities, rural and urban, but there must be recognition of the need for adaptability/flexibility and changing technologies at the outset in requirements for new development sites for housing, but not uniquely so.</p>	<p>information about Lifetime Homes shortly. These requirements will be given consideration in the pre-submission policy.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO4534</a></p>	<p>Policy 8A</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>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 of land 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>We will follow NPPF requirements on housing density in urban areas.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4724</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	<p>I would make a plea in this section for more bungalows to be included in any plans for housing type within the plan. Building a range of bungalows which are attractive to residents of both social housing and owner occupiers will free up family homes in other areas of Kidderminster as people can downsize into something more suitable. (Para 2.9 table 2.0.1)</p> <p>I understand that developers don't like building bungalows as the 'footprint' is bigger and they can't cram in so many 'dwellings' to maximise their profits but, for once, I would like to think that my council would put the needs of residents over that of the developers.</p>	The updated OAHN will provide more information on the housing requirements of older people. The Council must consider the financial viability of a site alongside meeting a range of needs.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1143</a>	Policy 8A	Comment	Table 8.0.1 refers to 96.2% of affordable dwellings being one-bed or two-bed dwellings. This is an extremely high, particularly in comparison to 3% of 3 bed dwellings and it would be helpful to set out the local issues justifying such a proportion. Section 8.6 refers to the AMION report, which presumably sets out the more detailed evidence behind the figures, but from a cursory scan through this report, the relevant section wasn't immediately obvious. Given the proportion is so high, it may be worth summarising the evidence within the Local Plan itself.	This information is included in the Amion report. This will be updated by a new OAHN.
	<a href="#">LPPO4655</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>The need for social housing and genuinely affordable housing:</p> <p>Section 8 of the local plan provides compelling evidence of the need for more social housing locally. The over-</p>	Comments noted. The council works with Empty Property owners who want to bring properties back into use and would support conversion of units where it is appropriate to do so.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>estimate of all dwellings confirmed may disguise the urgent need for social housing. The Spennells will not provide the social housing and affordable housing needed as it is traditionally mixed housing.</p> <p>Worcester Street, from the old Woolworths premises to the estate agents adjoining Prospect Hill looks tired and detracts considerably. With the uptake of internet shopping footfall is unlikely to increase. Surely, the few un-boarded retail businesses on Worcester Street could relocate by a few yards, attracting more business and a greater buzz. The vacated properties could then be converted or replaced to provide the social and affordable housing desperately required</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2989</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>* I broadly support Option A because I feel that the infrastructure gains are very important.</p> <p>*Policy 13 on Public Transport needs to recognise the appalling bus services which we have at the moment. I feel that we should go back to municipally owned, supported and operated bus services. The three towns could be connected by a tram system.</p> <p>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>	Comments noted. Affordable housing has a local connection criteria applied to it.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>New housing developments need to be based on affordability for residents, with an emphasis on smaller, cheaper homes costing £130,000 and less.</p> <p>A "St Ives Scheme" which reserves new homes for local people has a lot to recommend it. Residents need to be able to afford to live and work in Wyre Forest. There is nothing gained by providing 6000 homes if they are filled with people who move into the area from elsewhere.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPP04496</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>Social housing must only be provided on the proviso that it is not for life but for a particular time. OAPs living cannot expect to occupy 3 bedroomed social housing when families need somewhere to live.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please see the Councils Tenancy Strategy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP03636</a>	Policy 8B	Object	<p>The 100 affordable homes to be built per annum should be increased % wise to 50% of the overall total of homes built. Affordable housing provision should be increased to 40% on sites of 11+ splitting for 20% rent 20% buy shared ownership.</p> <p>The build to rent scheme should be encouraged and matched to working partnerships and non traditional methods should be compulsory.</p> <p>You say that you support such projects, however when The Balanced Oak proposal was set before you, even though most departments were in favour, no support was offered at all.</p>	<p>The percentage of affordable homes is based on the Viability study undertaken alongside the Local Plan review. At the time this indicated that 30% was an appropriate and deliverable threshold. The split between affordable rented to shared ownership products is outlined in the Amion study based on the evidence of affordability and incomes across the district.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01555</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>Do not dispute that there is a considerable shortfall in affordable housing in the District.</p> <p>The current wording of the policy seeks to achieve a minimum of 30% affordable housing, suggesting that the rate sought may indeed be higher. The Council’s viability assessment has appraised the affordable housing threshold of 30%, but has not tested any alternative scenarios and as such, the Council is unjustified in seeking these requirements.</p> <p>It should be expected that the affordable housing target should be guided by the level of need, derived from the SHMA and the financial capability of schemes to contribute towards the target.</p> <p>Do not agree with the Council’s current evidence as part of this policy and would expect that this is given further consideration prior to submission, to ensure that the evidence is proportionate and takes into account local data surrounding including land values, construction costs and the implications of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule.</p>	The council will use an updated viability study to determine thresholds for affordable housing but has tested a range of affordable housing thresholds across a range of sites – please see the viability technical evidence.
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPP01657</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>The Group would recommend including the possibility of mixed tenure housing on rural exception sites where open market homes can be proven to make sites viable.</p> <p>Please also see comments made by West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium.</p>	Comments noted and inline with current policy.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01519</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>Level of housing provision is stated to be 100 dwellings per annum, which is 10 dwellings higher than that identified in Policy 6A. Level of provision should be consistent with the development requirements.</p> <p>Policy outlines a level of 30% affordable, no evidence examining the viability of delivering this level of affordable housing. Such evidence needs to demonstrate the policy aspiration is deliverable.</p> <p>Tenure split - 65 rented and 35 intermediate tenure target, Table G4 shows four years of affordable housing provision this is a very short period and the individual years show very different proportions, which on average overall represent 65 rented and 35 intermediate. Plan should not be too prescriptive setting out targets should be flexible to allow for site specific circumstances where it may be appropriate to offer a different proportional split.</p> <p>Build to rent schemes, policy requires security of tenure through tenancy agreements of 3 years or more. This may not be appropriate for all build to rent proposals, should be some flexibility of this requirement.</p> <p>In terms of encouraging a scheme to consider non-traditional building methods where poor viability has been demonstrated, such methods may offer a cost saving, this is unlikely to be the case for national volume housebuilders who have particular house types and</p>	<p>Policy will be amended to ensure consistency of figures throughout the document.</p> <p>The viability study was included as part of the evidence available on the website.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>We will follow PPG and NPPF requirements.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>processes that currently maximise efficiency in both design and build.</p> <p>The concept of starter homes, in the Housing White Paper 2017, is not referred to within the emerging policy. The White Paper states that they want local authorities to deliver starter homes as part of a mixed package of affordable housing that can respond to the local needs and markets and that the Government will commence a general duty on Council's to promote the supply of starter homes. Finally, it is proposed that the Government will amend the NPPF to introduce a clear policy expectations that housing sites deliver a minimum 10% affordable home ownership units. It is considered that the Council should review the affordable housing policy and incorporate starter homes within the definition, which will serve to meet the needs of households in Wyre Forest District.</p>	
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	<a href="#">LPPO1206</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	States that a min average annual of 100 Affordable dwellings will be delivered. Table 6.0.1 at Policy 6A states need as 90 per year. 65/35% tenure split - is that correct, I would have expected rental split to be higher (75%?)	<p>Policy will be amended to ensure consistency of figures throughout the document.</p> <p>The split is based on affordability and income correct at the time the OAHN was completed in 2017.</p>
Victoria Carpets	<a href="#">LPPO1502</a>	Policy 8B	Support	We support the flexibility in Policy 8B which recognises that the proposed level of provision (30% on sites of 11 or more dwellings) may not be achievable on all development sites and this would need to be evidenced	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				through independently verified financial viability assessment. This is in accordance with the NPPF.	
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPP01358</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>The affordable housing target should be fully justified through an assessment of whole plan viability.</p> <p>The proposed tenure split is expressed as being indicative. The definition of affordable housing may well change over the life time of the Local Plan. The exact split will also need to be determined by market conditions on a site by site basis.</p> <p>Local planning policies should allow the housing density and mix on individual sites to be determined on a case by case basis according to individual site requirements and prevailing market conditions to ensure that sites are viable and responsive to the particular circumstances associated with them.</p>	Comments noted.
West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium	<a href="#">LPP01335</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>The following line in Policy 8B needs to be reviewed or deleted from the Policy: <i>“Individual site characteristics may mean that this level of provision is not achievable on all development sites and this will need to be evidenced by the applicant through an independently verified financial viability assessment.”</i> This sentence does not clarify that a viability assessment will be required if provision fall below 30% meaning that the Council could request a full viability assessment for every application even if they are over-providing which is unreasonable and unjustified. We recommend that the Council clarify this policy and recommend that the</p>	Comments noted. We will follow NPPF requirements regarding viability testing the plan and only further viability testing if schemes are non-compliant.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Council seek to negotiate delivery that suits individual circumstances.</p> <p>We recommend removing the NPPF definition in this section as you don't need to repeat national policy. Further, the definition of affordable housing in the NPPF is under proposals to be amended to include such tenures as discount open market rented. Including a line which aligns the definition of affordable housing within the NPPF will ensure that the Local Plan stays up to date with changing national policy and innovative new models of affordable housing which can maximise delivery across the Plan period.</p> <p>The reference to sub-market private rent is not in the current definition of affordable housing as set in the NPPF and therefore should be removed as it is not consistent with national policy.</p>	
Homes England	<a href="#">LPPO813</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>Policy states minimum of 30% affordable housing will be required on sites of 11 dwellings or more. The policy recognises that in some cases this level may not be achievable, and in such instances evidence is required by a financial viability assessment. This policy is supported as it recognises that 30% may not be viable in all cases</p> <p>With regards to the indicative tenure split of 65% rented and 35% intermediate, it is agreed that this provision should be subject to housing need at the time of construction, and the viability of individual schemes</p>	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				as the required split could change over the plan period.	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0936</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	30% requirement for affordable housing is lower than Bromsgrove and Birmingham which have 40% achieved by allowing % of intermediate tenures. Oppose use of thresholds. This policy implies no rural affordable homes unless on rural exception sites which would require public funding making delivery harder.	Please see the separate rural housing policy.
Miller Homes	<a href="#">LPP0972</a>	Policy 8B	Support	<p><b>Support</b> the inclusion of the explicit recognition within the wording of this Policy that individual site characteristics may mean that the stated 30% affordable housing provision is not achievable on all development sites, if evidenced through a financial viability assessment, and that the exact tenure split will be determined on a site by site basis based on housing need and viability (if relevant).</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires<sup>1</sup> that:</p> <p><i>“Local planning authorities should set out their policy on local standards in the Local Plan, including requirements for affordable housing. They should assess the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the development plan, when added to nationally required standards. In order to be appropriate, the cumulative impact of these standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should</i></p>	The policy will be updated to include current NPPF guidance.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p><i>facilitate development throughout the economic cycle. Evidence supporting the assessment should be proportionate, using only appropriate available evidence”.</i></p> <p>It is therefore important for the new Local Plan to take appropriate evidence and development viability into consideration when setting and applying affordable housing policies, to account for the fact that every development site is different.</p>	
Rentplus	<a href="#">LPPO1109</a>	Policy 8B	Comment	<p>The minimum annual average target given in this policy differs from that set out in Policy 6A; we support the higher target figure, but note that to achieve higher delivery the Council should be as flexible as possible in negotiating mix and delivery mechanisms with providers of affordable housing. This includes being flexible on the tenure split, as already set out in the policy; this should include allowing for the delivery of rent to buy as a hybrid model which provides a route to home ownership through affordable rent. The need for rented homes is well recognised by the Plan, and this need will be met by the delivery of an appropriate range of social rented, affordable rented and rent to buy housing. The statement that the Council will reflect the White Paper proposals should be reflected in the final version of this policy:</p> <p><i>“An indicative tenure split of 65% rented (including social, affordable and rent to buy) and 35% intermediate</i></p>	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p><i>tenure (including sub-market private rent and shared ownership) will be sought for affordable housing provision on new sites. The exact split to be determined on a site by site basis based on housing need and viability (if relevant)."</i></p> <p>The above recommended alteration will enable the Council to be responsive to the Government's emphasis on widening opportunities for home ownership, whilst still meeting the significant levels of need for rented properties.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO1706</a>	Plough Lane, Far Forest	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change of character to the area.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1037</a>	Policy 8C	Support	<p>We support this policy, but suggest that the criteria for rural exception sites should include additional wording from the NPPF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “..housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities.”</li> <li>• “..authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances...”</li> </ul>	We will consider this amendment to the policy.
National Farmers Union	<a href="#">LPPO1119</a>	Policy 8C	Comment	Welcomes the support for small scale residential development to meet local needs in rural settlements.	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
West Midlands Region				Also welcomes the policy on Rural Workers Dwellings. Encouraging that the council has recognised proposed rural workers dwellings need to be of a size commensurate with the functional requirement and financial capabilities of the enterprise. When new dwellings are constructed for farm businesses it is important that they are large enough to cope with the many demands of the farm business (such as an office entrance porch and utility), together with the needs of a farming family. This is important for maintaining adequate bio security measures. An agricultural dwelling must be flexible enough to accommodate families at a range of life stages. Farming families do not have the option of moving house if they should outgrow their home and this must be recognised when planning new accommodation.	
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	<a href="#">LPP01213</a>	Policy 8C	Comment	We mention comprehensive marketing for 12 months to support COU in Policy 21A. Should we be specifying a similar timeframe within policy 8C (rural workers dwellings).	Comments noted. We will consider if this is necessary in policy update.
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	<a href="#">LPP01214</a>	Policy 8C	Comment	We mention comprehensive marketing for 12 months to support COU. Thinking back, should we be specifying a similar timeframe within policy 8C (rural workers dwellings) above.	Comments noted. We will consider if this is necessary in policy update.
West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium	<a href="#">LPP01336</a>	Policy 8C	Comment	The policy seeks to require all affordable housing to be retained <i>in perpetuity</i> ; this is not appropriate. The NPPF does not require all affordable housing to be retained <i>in perpetuity</i> , instead stating that it should “include	We will amend the policy to ensure compliance with the NPPF.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p><i>provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision” (Annex 2 definition). It is only when defining rural exception sites does the NPPF mention affordable housing being retained <i>in perpetuity</i>. The Council’s policy should be amended to reflect this, as even with intermediate affordable homes can residents ‘staircase out’ to full ownership, and the Right to Buy will also remove affordable housing stock in the long term. The Government’s Proposed Changes to National Policy has also recently recommended changes to affordable housing policy, including that some models of affordable housing “<i>may not be subject to ‘in perpetuity’ restrictions</i>”. This policy should remove any reference to affordable housing being retained <i>in perpetuity</i>, focusing instead on transferring dwellings to Registered Providers at an appropriate cost.</i></p> <p>Further, we believe that the reference to replacing lost units with a replacement unit is not deliverable or justified and should be removed.</p>	
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1360</a>	Policy 8C	Comment	<p>Under 'Rural Exception Sites', the first three words of part (i) should be deleted.</p> <p>Under 'Replacement Dwellings in the Open Countryside', part (ii) should refer to "curtilage only being amended if required", rather than "of".</p>	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				Part (iii) should introduce the list with a colon, not a semicolon.	
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPP01376</a>	Policy 8C	Comment	<p>Strategy of accommodating development in Kidderminster and the market towns should not be at expense of meeting housing and employment needs of other settlements. The needs of the sustainable rural settlements should be assessed and meaningful growth apportioned to them to ensure their ongoing vitality and viability. Consideration of setting and character of a village must be balanced against the needs of the local community for new housing.</p> <p>In allocating sites, the Council needs to maximise housing supply by having the widest possible range of sites by size and location. Key to increased supply is the number of sales outlets offering a wide range of products and across different types of locations. It is vital that the evidence base considers how rural communities will sustain and enhance their sustainability over the plan period to avoid the risk of a negative approach that could directly lead to a decline in population and services.</p>	Comments noted.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01520</a>	Policy 8C	Comment	No comments.	No comments necessary.
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPP01659</a>	Policy 8C	Comment	In the first paragraph in the Rural Exception Sites section, it states that the District Council “will work closely with.....” and then list various bodies / organisations. We would strongly encourage the	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				inclusion of Registered Providers in this statement. Notwithstanding this, we agree with Policy 8C.	
	<a href="#">LPO2975</a>	Policy 8C	Object	<p><b>The Local Plan Review proposes inflexible policy towards housing in rural areas.</b></p> <p>The local Plan Review seems to discredit and deny rural areas opportunity to contribute to housing mix by its narrow site approach, contrary to the approach advocated in NPPG guidance May 2016 Rural Housing. ‘ALL settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas (para 55 NPPG , Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes/paras 54, 55-), and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing others from expanding should be avoided, unless their use can be supported by robust evidence’.</p> <p>For example boundaries to Callow End settlement exclude Fingerpost Cottage, which is probably one of the oldest houses in the locality. Houses developed on part of its former frontage have been included in the defined settlement of Callow End, but Finger Post Cottage was not.</p> <p>It is hoped that policy 8C of the Local Plan Review can be amended so as to provide a more robust and relevant consideration to housing development and include sites such as Fingerpost Cottage site in the plan for housing, providing for a real diversity of housing supply, so as to provide for rural housing need with a range of high quality homes, appropriate to the site and its locality as</p>	<p>Comments noted. As part of the pre-submission work we are reviewing village boundaries in non-Green Belt areas, such as Rock Parish. As a large part of the district is covered by Green Belt, we have commissioned consultants to undertake a Green Belt review. The Green Belt review has informed the site allocations and the policies within the emerging plan. Settlements washed over by Green Belt are constrained by Green Belt policy which limits the amount of development that can take place in these locations. Policy 8C does include Rural Exception Sites for affordable housing in Green Belt locations where this is deemed suitable and meets the criteria set within the policy.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				flexible spaces and homes for the future.	
	<a href="#">LPP02937</a>	Policy 8C	Object	<p>Rural areas can contribute more to housing mix without detriment to landscape and sustainability. Government guidance considers rural housing essential to the sustainability and viability of local facilities. The LPR recognizes that Bewdley for example, as a local market town, provides local services that will be used by the surrounding local community. The existing rural community travels to Bewdley and supports this vibrant town. This may be associated with tourism but it also a significant reflection on the income levels of the surrounding rural area. The 40 houses on 2 sites at For Forest represent a concentration of new development, with the only additional contribution at Bliss Gate, of 5 houses, as the only small scale contribution to rural housing need. Sustainability, as NPPF indicates, includes widening the choice of high quality homes. Responding to different opportunities in different areas must be provided for by taking local circumstances into account. Particularly in relation to the provision of housing in the more expensive but rural parishes in the west of the plan area, such as Rock, by policy beyond that of 8C and settlement boundaries drawn up years ago- would these be a 'blanket policy' described by Rural Housing policy guidance as to be avoided?</p> <p>The Local Plan Review proposes inflexible policy towards housing in rural areas.</p>	Comments noted. We will support housing in rural areas with a demonstrable need and in sustainable locations.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				LPR also seems to discredit and deny rural areas opportunity to contribute to housing mix by its narrow site approach contrary to the approach advocated in PPG guidance May 2016 Rural Housing. 'All settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas, delivering a wide choice of high quality homes', and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing others from expanding should be avoided, unless their use can be supported by robust evidence'.	
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1144</a>	Policy 8C	Comment	<p>The policy begins by referring to "small scale residential development". This is currently ambiguous as to whether this is referring to market or affordable dwellings or a combination of both.</p> <p>The third sentence states that "Small scale residential schemes that take account of local housing needs on windfall sites will be proactively considered within the rural areas". It is unclear what "proactively considered" means. Would "positively considered" provide greater clarity if it is the intention that these sites would be looked upon favourably for a grant of planning permission (subject to meeting policy requirements, etc.)?</p> <p>Under 'Rural Workers Dwellings', part (iii) refers to the "financial capabilities of the enterprise". It is unclear what this means and this could benefit from some supporting text or a footnote to provide clarity.</p>	We will consider this amendment to the policy.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO1831</a>	Housing for older people	Comment	Senior living apartment blocks should be developed in the town centre, encouraging people to downsize and freeing up larger properties. There are two large buildings in Kidderminster that would appear to be suitable for conversion to this type of living accommodation. Crown House and a large building in Worcester Street (formerly Council offices) are standing empty. There is also the former Glades site on which really nice living accommodation should be incorporated into any development that happens.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO4073</a>	Housing Type	Comment	<b>Retirement/low level housing:</b> I would like to see on any development, particularly on Lea Castle, 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. This may well have the desired effect for local elderly residents who currently live in 3/4 bedroom houses, who wish to downsize but do not want to leave the area, thus in the process freeing up current housing for families. If Lea Castle were to be expanded even with a good mix of this type of housing with other housing this would be a good way forward. We have a responsibility for affordable housing but we also have a responsibility to our ageing population to give them an opportunity to downsize but stay close (in a 'village') to where they have lived all their life, in a safe environment, easier to	Comments noted. We will ensure development on Lea Castle meets the range of affordable housing needs identified.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				manage property (bungalow), with resources on their doorstep. Lea Castle is the perfect site for this. It will also create jobs and business opportunities.	
	<a href="#">LPPO4900</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>Housing objectives in the Kidderminster Central Area Action Plan, adopted in 2013 include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the amount of people living within the town centre.</li> <li>• The elderly may want to downsize to smaller residential units which could free up family sized accommodation. Therefore, we need to ensure that residential development caters for all groups in society.</li> </ul> <p>Objective assessment of housing need report says:</p> <p>‘Building properties designed for older people was overwhelming ranked the highest priority for Wyre Forest with 75% of respondents recognising this as a high priority and the remaining 25% a medium priority. Building affordable homes to rent was also recognised as important, with 63% of respondents ranking this as a high priority and 31% a medium priority. Building affordable homes to buy, including shared ownership or shared equity, was considered a medium to high priority, with 44% of stakeholders ranking this a high priority and 44% a medium priority. Building properties designed for people with specialist needs in the District was rated highly with 40% ranking this a high priority</p>	The OAHN revision should provide more detailed requirements for certain groups identified by the NPPF.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>and 60% a medium priority’.</p> <p>There seems to have been little regard for this in the preparation of the preferred options document.</p>	
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPPO5094</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>Agrees that in order for the area to prosper, we need to encourage working age families to the area so that there is a better balanced ‘Circle of Life’ in the area. This makes sense as there does need to be room to allow younger generations to come through and make Wyre Forest an aspirational place to live.</p> <p>Wyre Forest has an ageing population that most probably had young families 20-30 years ago. There is perfectly sufficient housing within Wyre Forest for young families, however, these family homes are not being vacated by the 45-64 &amp; 65+ residents. There is a need to free up existing ‘family’ housing stock.</p> <p>There is a need for properties to be built to suit these groups of people. Not traditional bungalows, but properties that include: two parking spaces and a guest space; <i>some</i> garden; at least two spacious bedrooms; a bathroom each; a study/office area; a garage or outhouse building for garden items; some sort of separate utility. Essentially incorporating everything they already have, minus a bedroom and a smaller garden. The solution could be to create a different type of property that takes into account the items above?</p>	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Given that Green Belt areas are being considered for development, perhaps modern barn complexes that look aesthetically pleasing across countryside views should be considered. These could be specifically designed, within courtyards, to be 2 bedroom properties that have a study on the ground floor (that could be used as a third bedroom), with a small area of private garden and an outhouse <i>storage/utility</i> attached. There would be two personal car parking spaces and plenty of communal guest parking centrally. Possibly 3-4 of these courtyards could form pockets of development to enable a community feel, avoid isolation and ensure it is economically viable to install utility / broadband services to each pocket of development. Whilst these modern barns would be relatively expensive however, relative to the equity saved up in a family home, the hope is they would be affordable to the target market, freeing the more affordable per square foot 'family homes' for younger generations</p> <p>While it is noted that the target residents would still be of a mobile age, some barns could be designed as single floor living; for example the ground floor being one apartment for those requiring no stairs and the 1st floor being accessed by stairs (or a lift dependent on cost).</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO4656</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>Much of the extra requirement for dwellings results from the aging demography, which requires targeted solutions:</p>	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				The plan suggests that the occupation per household is falling with static population growth (Table 2.0.1) less than 20% between 20 and 39 years of age. The requirement for more affordable housing with fewer bedrooms is clear; this cannot be accommodated solely by new build. Other, more targeted, creative and exciting solutions are required, such as co-housing, where the community is central to the design of the living space (for example Marmalade Lane or 'Owch). These insightful developments could utilise land better and provide improved lifestyle for residents. Supported through tax breaks and grants, the oxygen of publicity, favourable planning consent, provision of lists of active groups and individuals in search of groups this would be a positive, proactive response to the demographic problem. Section 8 (Summary of Consultation Responses) shows great foresight and suggests a comprehensive review of specialist housing. Doubtless the Council has many other creative ideas (such as providing annexes for the elderly suggested in section 8.29) that can be explored.	
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPP01672</a>	Policy 8D	Support	We particularly note and support the requirement within the Local Plan for “Housing for Older People and others with special housing requirements”.	Support is noted.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01521</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	Requirement for developers to provide evidence that they have considered self/ custom build, difficult to achieve in respect of both making efficient use of land; and to achieve design consistency. Could impact on viability. Further work needed to find out where	A more detailed self/custom build policy will be included in the pre-submission document.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>households would like to undertake a self build, so policies can provide for need rather than asking developers of all large sites to offer land.</p> <p>Regarding evidence to demonstrate that housing development proposals have considered tenures and types and for the need for 540 residential units to be met on sites allocated for housing. The care accommodation industry is very different to the house building industry. On larger schemes care homes can be provided for, on smaller schemes it is more difficult to make a viable and meaningful contribution.</p> <p>Policy should be flexible in requiring such specialist development given the complexities. Likely that opportunity sites will exclusively come forward for homes for older people and/ or specialist housing, which may meet the needs identified.</p>	
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1556</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>The Council has introduced a further new requirement as part of this policy relating to the provision of self-build housing. Introduced through the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015, there is a clear mandate for Local Authorities to understand the scale and requirement for self-build properties to provide evidence for the demand for this type of housing. The PPG proposes that this is done through the compilation of a Self-build register</p> <p>The Council has not provided any evidence of the total</p>	The number of households on the register were included in the draft planning policy. A specific custom/self build policy will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>need for self-build properties in the District, it is currently unknown how much provision is needed for the purposes of the Local Plan. As the evidence base for the self-build register is not available, the Council’s justifications for this policy are unclear and unfounded. In the absence of credible evidence, the policy needs to be made more flexible in order for self-build to be included in the plan, though not to the prescriptive extent expressed in the current policy.</p> <p>Do not agree with the Council’s current evidence as part of this policy and would expect that this is given further consideration prior to submission, to ensure that the evidence is proportionate and takes into account local data.</p> <p>Housing for older people and others with special housing requirements should also be considered in viability reports for sites, which is not included in the current policy as it stands.</p>	
Summerfield Against Land Transformation	<a href="#">LPP01613</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>You make much of the proportion of older people in the District. Despite this, developers are only required to have “fully considered” such needs and you have a target of only 540 C2 units over the life of the Plan.</p> <p>Specialist housing for older people needs a greater commitment and C2 provision needs to be more ambitious.</p>	Housing for older people can be met through provision of a range of different tenures and types in addition to the C2 requirement.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1383</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>Note proposal to require consideration of self-build plots in major housing developments. Flexibility needs to be built in to ensure plots are not prevented from being developed as a result of low demand for such products.</p> <p>Intention to plan for C2 accommodation is welcomed. Specialist housing with care for older people is a type of housing which provides choice to adults with varying care needs and enables them to live as independently as possible in their own self-contained homes, where people are able to access high quality, flexible support and care services on site to suit their individual needs (including dementia care).</p>	Comments noted.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1434</a>	Policy 8D	Object	<p>Acknowledge the need for all forms of housing where it can be demonstrated that provision is needed and is appropriate to that particular location.</p> <p>In the case of supported living, such provision should be regarded as fulfilling all or part of the affordable housing requirement for that particular site. Supported living accommodation is a specialist form of provision developed to meet the needs of those whose housing requirements will not be catered for by normal market or affordable housing provision.</p>	We will support the inclusion of supported housing on sites where it meets an identified housing need.
West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium	<a href="#">LPPO1337</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>It is recommended that the Council set out clearly what they mean by 'Housing for Older People' there are a number of different types of specialist housing for older people from 'age-restricted' housing to 'extra-care accommodation'. The common features of all four types</p>	The new OAHN will further identify housing needs for older people and this will be incorporated into the policy.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>are the age restriction, their specific design to meet the needs of older people, and a range of support services and shared spaces.</p> <p>Additionally the policy should explicitly support the development of specialist housing scheme which are separate to large scale housing developments. Example wording is provided below:</p> <p><i>“Homes for the elderly</i></p> <p><i>The Council will encourage the provision of housing for the elderly and for people with special needs, where appropriate whilst avoiding an undue concentration in any location.</i></p> <p><i>BDP10.2 The Council aims to ensure that older people are able to secure and sustain their independence in a home appropriate to their circumstances and to encourage developers to build new homes that can be readily adapted to meet the needs of those with disabilities and the elderly, as well as assisting independent living at home.</i></p> <p><i>BDP10.3 The Council will, through the identification of sites and/or granting of planning consents in sustainable locations, provide a wide range of elderly accommodation including the development of residential care homes, close care, ‘extra care’ and assisted care housing; and in particular Continuing</i></p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p><i>Care Retirement Communities which encompass an integrated range of such provision.</i></p> <p><i>Sites should be sustainable by virtue of their location and there will be a preference for sites within defined settlements. Where such sites are not available regard will be paid to the potential for development to be self-contained to reduce travel requirements and the availability and accessibility of public transport.”</i></p>	
Wyre Forest District Council - Community Led Housing	<a href="#">LPPO1203</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>Support paragraph 1: ‘The local plan will seek to allocate plots for self build and custom build housing to address the demand for the self and custom build register. Provision will be reviewed on an annual basis as part of the residential land availability assessment and will be based on the demand as set out in the register of need maintained by the council.</p> <p>The District Council will require all major housing development proposals to provide evidence that they have fully considered the provision of self / custom build within the overall housing mix on the site’.</p> <p>Having analysed the self- build and custom-build register, key points for WFDC to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Out of the 50 individuals who are registered, a total of 36 are residents of the Wyre Forest district and therefore have a local connection. There are 16 individuals registered who do not</li> </ol>	There will be a specific policy on self/custom build in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>have a local connection.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Out of the 50 registered, a total of 34 would consider a custom-build plot / home that was part of a new build housing development</li> <li>3. A total of 42 out of the 50 registered would consider the conversion of an existing building as an alternative to building a new property.</li> <li>4. A total of 12 individuals have expressed their interest in building eco-friendly homes (as highlighted in the 'comments' field of the register</li> </ol> <p>These figures reflect conversations with members of the public at the consultation drop-in sessions. There is real interest in town centre living and support the idea that empty buildings/old factories in around Kidderminster and Stourport centres could be considered for renovation as there is potential for bringing these empty buildings back into use and making them both affordable and desirable places to live.</p> <p>To support the consultation sessions, the register also demonstrates that 42 out of 50 individuals registered 'would consider the conversion of an existing building as an alternative to building new property.' If these can be prioritised it would reduce the amount of Green Belt land that will be required to meet future housing needs. The sticking point is likely to be 'location' but if empty</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>buildings were converted, they would appeal to those people who want the benefits of living in a central and accessible location, but without the high rents that can be associated with it. More town centre living would help make the town centre feel safer at night time, increase the night time economy and help support the newly established restaurants opening in the town centre.</p> <p>The self build / custom build register is a live portal and strongly support that the register be reviewed annually. As content for the WFDC website is created it will likely generate more interest and support for community-led housing as local people gain a better understanding about the umbrella term for ‘community-led’ and what it could mean for them.</p> <p>Hope that WFDC would be able to make a tangible offer to the self-build / custom build community and offer plots that could be considered for their projects. In time, there may be interest generated in a housing co-operative, co-housing or self-help housing. As it is a relative unknown in terms of where and if this might happen, it is hoped that the housing needs of all Wyre Forest residents could be taken into account and supported, despite there not being a definite timescale for when it might happen.</p>	
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO843</a>	Policy 8D	Support	<b>Policy 8D Specialist Housing Requirements:</b> BCS supports this policy but with a more sympathetic	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>approach to annex accommodation not only for carers but also for family members who perhaps cannot find suitable accommodation and wish to live together as an extended family under one roof.</p>	
Miller Homes	<a href="#">LPP0974</a>	Policy 8D	Object	<p><b>Object</b> to the requirement set out within Policy 8D requiring all major housing development proposals to provide evidence that they have fully considered the provision of self / custom build dwellings, bungalows, sheltered housing, extra care units and other types of supported housing within the overall housing mix on the site.</p> <p>Our client recognises that the Self Build and Custom House Building Regulations 2016 requires Wyre Forest District Council (WFDC) to have regard to a register of people who are interested in self build or custom build projects in the area and that the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)<sup>1</sup> specifies that Local Plans should consider the size, location and quantity of dwellings needed within the area to allow older people to live independently and safely in their own home for as long as possible. However the Local Plan Policy wording and supporting text justification do not explain what a housebuilder needs to do in order to fully consider the provision of the identified housing types, introducing ambiguity and uncertainty into the application of this policy requirement.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> PPG Para 021 Reference ID: 2a-021-20160401.</p>	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO306</a>	Policy 8D	Support	I support draft Policy 8: Accommodation for Family Members and Carers, but it would be strengthened by the addition of “and Dependant Relatives”	Comments noted.
Homes England	<a href="#">LPPO815</a>	Policy 8D	Support	The Council require development proposals to fully consider the provision of self/custom build within the overall housing mix on site. However, in relation to housing for older people and specialist requirements, it is considered that the policy needs to be clearer as to what it means by “...proposals to provide evidence that they have fully considered the provision of the following tenure and type within the overall housing mix on site.” The policy needs to provide clearer guidance as to what evidence the Council required, as currently this statement is open to interpretation.	This policy element will be revised once we have undertaken the revised OAHN which will include greater identification of the needs of older people.
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1034</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>The provision of care homes and sheltered/extra care units needs close collaboration with County-level Social and Health services; they should have a clearer picture of the scale and type of provision needed. For residential and nursing care, there may be benefits in encouraging more purpose-built properties as well as conversions.</p> <p>Linking the provision of sheltered/extra care units to specific/separate developments may lead to pepper-potting (scattering) of these facilities, which may not be the most suitable or effective way of providing or supporting these properties. Again, Social and Health care input would be beneficial.</p>	Comments noted. We work closely with Commissioning Managers at WCC in meeting supported housing needs.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01145</a>	Policy 8D	Comment	<p>This policy would benefit from being divided into two, with Policy 8D concerning self-build and custom housing, and a new Policy 8E on housing for older people and others with special housing requirements (with consequent amendments to policy numbering for the current Policy 8E and 8F).</p> <p>We welcome the policy's requirement for all major developments to consider bungalows and extra care needs within the overall housing mix. Specific policy support for accommodation for family members and carers is also welcomed.</p> <p>Specific support for those with disabilities should also be included in this policy.</p> <p>We would, however, encourage the Local Plan to require all new housing, or a proportion of new housing, to be built to design standards that allow people to remain in their own homes for as long as possible. The majority of people prefer to remain in their own homes as they grow older, where necessary making changes and adaptations to their properties should their needs change. New homes should be encouraged to meet the Lifetime Homes standard (<a href="http://www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/">www.lifetimehomes.org.uk/</a>) which is intended to allow homes to meet changing needs over the course of people's lives. The application of such standards to new build properties can help to realise some older people's aspirations to stay in their homes for longer.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>There is currently provision for lifetime homes and this will be updated in line with any national guidance.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP04726</a>	Policy 8E	Comment	Gypsy sites are always a problem and I don't have any quick fix for this except to say that both options look reasonable although it may not appear so to local residents and businesses.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPP0742</a>	Policy 8E	Comment	Comments made confidentially on behalf of a client.	Comments noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01361</a>	Policy 8E	Comment	The text at the end of the policy should refer to "medium-term needs up to 2020".	Comments noted.
Historic England	<a href="#">LPP01270</a>	Policy 8E	Comment	Policy 8E relates to potential development sites for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation - what assessment has been undertaken as to the impact for the historic environment? How will these issues and opportunities be included within the Plan? This comment also relates to Policy 8F.	A Heritage Impact Assessment Study is being prepared and will be published at pre-submission stage. This study considers the sites and the potential heritage impacts. The purpose of the Heritage Impact Assessment is to support the Local Plan by demonstrating how the historic environment has been considered in the site selection process and to assess the likely impact on heritage assets, (both designated and non-designated) and whether any impact can be mitigated.
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups	<a href="#">LPP03349</a>	Policy 8E	Object	Restricting sites to those which are "on previously developed land or in areas allocated primarily for residential development subject to all relevant policies" will effectively prevent any sites being acceptable since	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				sites which comply with this restrictive policy will be equally acceptable for mainstream housing and will thus inevitable be beyond the reach of Travellers.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3540</a>	Policy 8E	Comment	I would also like to say that any proposals regarding the travelling community for further sites in the future should be done in Kidderminster, Bewdley or any other areas in Wyre forest except for Stourport as i feel that Stourport has already done their provision and other areas need to step up if any more sites are needed	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3542</a>	Policy 8E	Object	Park home sights, classed in your mandate as Caravan and Holiday sights. It is with interest that you are committed with venom NOT TO ALLOW, 12 months occupation of these dwellings. You point out that the elderly could down size, surely these dwellings are ideal for the older population, but because of the Shutdown of the sights yearly, it is neither viable, ideal or cost worthy to vacate a family home for this option.	Caravan and holiday sites are not seen as appropriate long term housing solutions due to the insecurity of residency.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1146</a>	Policy 8E	Comment	The text at the end of the policy states that "Further small scale sites to meet the indicative need of 21 pitches to 2034 will be allocated in the Local Plan". Should the preferred options not seek to meet identified needs at this stage? There doesn't seem to be any evidence of why these additional pitches have not been identified.	Current need for pitches provision has been met. A revised GTAA will be undertaken in the future to form the evidence base for need requirements.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1523</a>	Policy 8F	Comment	No comments.	No comments necessary.
	<a href="#">LPPO3114</a>	8.0.6	Object	This plan is contrary to previous planning advice. Access	Objection noted. The proposed sites

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>will cause an extra hazard on an already very busy road. Local business will suffer, particularly the hotel.</p> <p>Wribbenhall schools are already overcrowded, and showpeople's children will need places there.</p>	<p>continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3111</a>	8.0.6	Object	<p>This plan is contrary to previous planning advice. Access will cause an extra hazard on an already very busy road. Local business will suffer, particularly the hotel.</p> <p>Wribbenhall schools are already overcrowded, and showpeople's children will need places there.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2208</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<p>Objects to BR/RO/1 as a potential site for travelling show people.</p> <p>Believes the site is unsuitable because some years ago the yard was subject to a Public Inquiry as it has been created without the necessary permissions being obtained.</p> <p>Responsible authorities do not appear to have enforced the resulting directions of the Public Inquiry. There is a belief that the original construction was undertaken by using unsuitable materials including scrap vehicles.</p> <p>The land is unsuitable as a parking place for large numbers of heavy vehicles.</p> <p>As an alternative, there are former factory sites in</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Stourport and Kidderminster which would be eminently more suitable for the proposed use, having been properly constructed and more accessible.</p> <p>Problems with main drains in Clows Top - currently residential and business premises have no access to main drains - the dependence on septic tank drainage has caused the local authority to impose conditions on any proposed residential developments that any new builds would need to be connected to main drains.</p> <p>Therefore, the increased use/occupation of this site would necessitate the requirement for appropriate foul drainage provision in line with the local authority requirements to prevent any hazardous environmental damage being caused.</p> <p>Traffic - this has increased in recent years. Pavements provision in this part of the village is less than adequate with an interrupted pavement on only one side of the road. It is hazardous enough at the present time and any increase in the levels of danger and inconvenience to pedestrians and other road users would be unacceptable.</p> <p>Any Local Plan should address the real Community issues that exist, rather than create more detrimental ones.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2146</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	High volume of traffic that passes through the cross	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				roads.  Insufficient facilities to cater for travellers community, no school doctors etc.	most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2149</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	The large increase in traffic both leaving and joining the carriageway in the close vicinity of the busy crossroads which already has bad visibility and is an accident hotspot.  In my opinion a site of this type and of this density will cause levels of noise and disturbance that will result in infinite complaints from the surrounding residents  Detrimental to the area	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2215</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	Objects to BR/RO/1, Section 19, Clows Top due to the following reasons:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is dangerous for vehicles, especially large lorries at the crossroads.</li> <li>• The footpath opposite the site is already damaged - when the lorries using it now leave and enter the site they have to go on to the opposite footpath to be able to get on to the road. This has an impact on local residents who have to use the footpath with potholes.</li> <li>• Safety - if fairground lorries and their families reside there, access onto the A456 by children should be considered.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability to manoeuvre trailers, caravans and lorries, crossing the carriageway of the A456 to get on site.</li> <li>• Sewerage - would it be that the families would have to be responsible to get their sanitation needs onto a septic tank set up, how would that work?</li> <li>• Electricity - would dwellings have to be put onto the normal power supplies?</li> <li>• Drainage - where would all the sink and bath water waste be directed?</li> <li>• As a local resident, all of the above issues have presented problems.</li> <li>• 9. Clows Top water is dependant on the pumping station just outside the village at the bottom of the bank towards Bayton. As soon as there was anything like a problem, Clows Top water was first to stop. Extra families drawing from that would not help.</li> <li>• 10. Any sort of housing is going to put a strain on the facilities as it stands at the moment but if housing has to happen then let it be a sensible amount of houses on the right sanitation set up, with sensible access to the A456. That way the village of Clows Top will remain just that a “village”.</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2379</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<p>Object to the Clows Top site for Travelling Showpeople:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase in traffic, especially heavy vehicles</li> <li>2. Dangerous site access</li> <li>3. Noise pollution</li> </ol>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>4. Who would be responsible for the site and limit its use as req'd</p> <p>Personal perception that unlike the local residents, people using the site would have no shared interest in improving the area.</p>	documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2399</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<p>Object Travellers/show people site at Clows Top:</p> <p>Understand land has to be made available but this road is unsuitable and would be dangerous for more traffic; crossroads are already hazardous.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3300</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cross roads on the A456 are already dangerous because of the volume of traffic.</li> <li>• The roads at this point are too narrow to allow such vehicles to turn into or out</li> <li>• The hill approaching the site from Bewdley is very steep with a very limited view of oncoming traffic.</li> </ul> <p>The alternative use of this site to allow a limited housing development would be viable if the sewage problems could be solved.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3447</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No main sewage in the in village.</li> <li>2. Major traffic hazard.</li> <li>3. Impact of local facilities by influx of additional people.</li> <li>4. Inadequate electricity supply.</li> </ol>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>5. Your map incorrect on some details.</p> <p>Land on the site is unsuitable land likely to break up with any heavy-weight vehicle or new building.</p>	documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3500</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<p>We object to the proposed Traveller, Show people and Gypsy Site at Clows Top.</p> <p>The land at Clows Top has already been disregarded as a potential Traveller, Show people and Gypsy site in previous consultations. Access to and from the site would result in the crossroads becoming more dangerous.</p> <p>We understand the site has already been considered for residential use and as a former garage site the land is probably contaminated. The cost of dealing with this should be borne by potential developers, as should the cost of providing sewage and storm water systems.</p> <p>We understand that Travellers and gypsy communities prefer to be located near good transport systems, doctors and schools.</p> <p>We are sure there is no support from Rock Parish Council or the local community for Travellers, Show people or Gypsies to be located on the land at Clows Top.</p> <p>We support residential building on this site which we</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				think would help sustain this village and local community.	
	<a href="#">LPO3501</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<p>We object to the proposed Traveller/Show People and Gypsy Site at Clows Top. The land has already been disregarded for this use in previous consultations.</p> <p>Clows Top needs more affordable housing. This would encourage local young people to stay in the village and keep this community alive and help to sustain local businesses such as the village store, post office and butchers.</p> <p>Access to and from the site would result in the crossroads becoming even more dangerous crossroads and access to the current car park is wholly unsuitable for large, slow moving vehicles. Changes to the road infrastructure would be costly and would cause traffic problems. Works relating to a housing development should be carried out and paid for by the developer.</p> <p>As a brown field site, there is likely to be significant ground remediation before any development can take place. This should be paid for by a developer, as should the cost of providing a sewage and storm water system As you will be aware there is a government incentive to build more new homes where deferred infrastructure charges relating to new water connections are waived, provided that new homes meet strict water usage criteria. This would be a significant and unavoidable cost</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>born by tax payers if the development is not designated for new homes.</p> <p>We understand that travellers and gypsy communities prefer to be located near better transport systems, doctors and schools, which are not present at Clows Top.</p> <p>We are sure there is no support from Rock Parish Council or the local community for Travellers, Show people or Gypsies to be located on the land at Clows Top</p> <p>We would support for residential building on this site which we would help sustain this village and local community. Clows Top needs more affordable housing. This would encourage local young people to stay in the village and keep this community alive and help to sustain local businesses, as has happened in other villages.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO4318</a>	BR/RO/1	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>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4320</a>	BR/RO/1	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>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4321</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<p>close to the crossroad junction and the 456 is well used by heavy traffic</p> <p>no local police or hospital so there could be a wait for rescue services</p> <p>lack of employment schools medical requirements</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4322</a>	BR/RO/1	Comment	<p>I have to support the <b>dual allocations</b> for the land. Although it is of course preferred to become a small housing development and in-keeping.</p> <p>This (housing development) is indeed supported by the majority of all within the village parish.</p>	Comment noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO4325</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<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>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<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="#">LPP0667</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<p><u>Old transport yard, Clows</u></p> <p>Objects to site due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• site at summit of steep hill and dangerous crossroads - not suitable for heavy vehicles</li> <li>• adjoining land recently bought by builder - proposal would make sale of homes harder</li> <li>• sewage - not on mains</li> <li>• noise and light pollution</li> <li>• electricity - overhead cables - issues with strong winds</li> <li>• environmental waste from site not wanted</li> <li>• horses not welcome</li> </ul> <p>Personal perception that there may be security concerns for shops and homes and a belief that property would be even harder to sell.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP0668</a>	BR/RO/1	Object	<p><u>The Old Transport Yard off A456, Clows Top</u></p> <p>We do not want permission given for this site to be allowed for travelling/show people in our hamlet due to</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure - no mains sewerage, low water pressure and old pipes, increased run-off/drainage, busy road frontage near crossroads, on steep hill.</li> <li>• pollution from trucks/trailers, damage to road surface, noise and light pollution, unreliable electricity supply, extra waste</li> <li>• Personal perception that there may be issues around security and potentially increased costs to local residents</li> <li>• A perception that the new owner of adjacent site will have problem building/selling houses</li> </ul> <p>Concern that there may not be enough school provision and transport.</p>	<p>included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04666</a>	Ceram- aspeed	Comment	<p>This site isn't ideal because it is close to existing houses.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP01713</a>	Clows Top	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</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>influx of residents would not be suitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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 is 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="#">LPPO2076</a>	Clows Top	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The turning for proposed site is on the brow of the hill on a road with a 30mph; large slow moving vehicles would be a traffic hazard and add to pollution.</li> <li>2. There is no provision for sewerage</li> <li>3. Property value will decrease.</li> <li>4. Site already put forward and refuse in 2010; nothing changed.</li> </ol>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2086</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Unsuitable for a travelling/show people site; no mains sewerage and septic tanks could not be provided.</p> <p>Fairground lorries would create pollution/noise and poor access will result in traffic tailbacks/dangerous driving conditions.</p> <p>This site was deemed unsuitable at the last consultation what has changed?</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2127</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>I strongly object to the proposal in policy 8F regarding the site at the rear of the village hall potentially being used for travellers and show people.</p> <p>Firstly, there is no mains sewage in the village of Clows Top and septic tanks would be highly controversial in that site as there is a runoff from this land into Dumbleton Brook on the opposite side of the road leading down to Pensax. This brook runs into a SSSI site.</p> <p>We have no schools, doctors, street lights, public transport to speak of. The electricity supply to Clows Top regularly fails due to poor infrastructure.</p> <p>Very poor access to this for large vehicles, as site at top of the steep hill where smaller vehicles approach at speed.</p> <p>The actual land itself is unstable and is likely to subside</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>with constant heavy traffic.</p> <p>In harsh winters, the village can be almost cut off to large vehicles</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2128</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>I object to the proposal in policy 8F regarding travelling show people on land at former Clows Top village, Clows Top.</p> <p>Access and roads – the only current access is directly onto the A456 on the top of a blind hill. A known danger spot at all times of year and which can be completely impassable in winter. Large vehicles pulling slowly out would be extremely dangerous.</p> <p>Lack of facilities and amenities – the villagers already struggle with insufficient amenities – there are no street lights for safety/security and the current electricity supply cannot cop with the existing demand with very frequent power cuts.</p> <p>The mains water supply is insufficient.</p> <p>There is no mains sewerage facility.</p> <p>There is no public transport to speak of.</p> <p>There is no doctors surgery, school, college, or opportunity for employment. Other than the village hall there is no entertainment (pub/cinema/park) for adults</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>or children.</p> <p>Clows Top is a small rural village and the introduction of a group of travellers could seriously impact the demographic make-up and feel of the village and community. This is a country village not an industrial site or car park for wagons.</p> <p>Noise – living across the crossroads and downhill from the proposed location, there is a big risk of significant noise pollution.</p> <p>Instability of land – there are indications that due to the previous use of the land, that the whole area is unstable and has insufficient drainage.</p> <p>We would want thorough investigations into any potential drainage into the stream on our property which runs into a registered SSSI site.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2209</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Objects to BR/RO/1 as a potential site for travelling show people.</p> <p>Believes the site is unsuitable because some years ago the yard was subject to a Public Inquiry as it has been created without the necessary permissions being obtained.</p> <p>Responsible authorities do not appear to have enforced the resulting directions of the Public Inquiry. There is a</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>belief that the original construction was undertaken by using unsuitable materials including scrap vehicles.</p> <p>The land is unsuitable as a parking place for large numbers of heavy vehicles.</p> <p>As an alternative, there are former factory sites in Stourport and Kidderminster which would be eminently more suitable for the proposed use, having been properly constructed and more accessible.</p> <p>Problems with main drains in Clows Top - currently residential and business premises have no access to main drains - the dependence on septic tank drainage has caused the local authority to impose conditions on any proposed residential developments that any new builds would need to be connected to main drains.</p> <p>Therefore, the increased use/occupation of this site would necessitate the requirement for appropriate foul drainage provision in line with the local authority requirements to prevent any hazardous environmental damage being caused.</p> <p>Traffic - this has increased in recent years. Pavements provision in this part of the village is less than adequate with an interrupted pavement on only one side of the road. It is hazardous enough at the present time and any increase in the levels of danger and inconvenience to pedestrians and other road users would be</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>unacceptable.</p> <p>Any Local Plan should address the real Community issues that exist, rather than create more detrimental ones.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2649</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Please register my objection to the use of the above site by travellers/show people. There are no facilities to house anyone on that land.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2764</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Objection relates to any part of the document (e.g. paragraph, policy, map, and table or figure reference) where the site at Clows Top is shown or proposed as potential site for Traveller, Showpeople, and Gypsy use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Proposed site is in contravention of government policies:</b> This proposal is in direct contravention of various components of the government guidelines, policies and previous statements made by the WFDC on this matter.</li> <li>• <b>The land at Clows Top has already been disregarded as potential Traveller site:</b> In 2011 the land at Clows Top was shortlisted as a site to be further investigated. After much debate and opposition of the local community the Clows Top Garage site (former Old Transport Yard) was confirmed as not suitable and not available as potential site for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and was therefore</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>disregarded from any future considerations by the WFDC. Circumstances regarding availability have not changed. It is our understanding that the current owner of the Clows Top Garage site is seeking to renew the planning permission for housing with a potential of approximately 30 dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Land at Clows Top is not suitable for use as Traveller site:</b> Central government policies and guidelines state that when identifying Traveller sites consideration must be given to the relationship of the site to the surrounding community. The site should not be located on contaminated land nor have unacceptable impact on the landscape or have adverse impact on the health, safety, and living conditions, be sustainable, supporting the lifestyle of the residents of these sites, offering access to facilities and scope to manage an integrated coexistence with the local community and the environment. Similar provisions can be found in the local policies and guidelines of WFDC. These criteria make it unlikely for the land at Clows Top to be utilised as such for a multitude of reasons. The site is neglected, has a public footpath, is possibly contaminated and does not have provisions in place to safeguard visual and acoustic privacy. Surface water drainage and storm water drainage must be installed but the foul drainage connection is at some distance</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>away in Rock.</p> <p>Access onto the A456 for use as Travellers site is poor. Not suitable for large show and fairground vehicles and equipment enter and exit the site. Commercial vehicles would be entering and leaving the proposed site at all hours, including night time. There is increased noise transference on main roads such as the A456, resulting in disproportionate nuisance and high noise disturbance to the wider community. For the same reason, this usage is not conducive to the health of the residents living in mobile homes even more so if joint commercial/residential use is envisaged.</p> <p>Many Gypsies and Travellers express a preference for a location that is on the edge of or closely located to a large town or city consistent with traditional lifestyles and means of employment. There is only one bus service from Tenbury Wells to Kidderminster, which is a limiting factor for employment. Furthermore, there is no easy access to General Practitioner and other health services.</p> <p>There is no aesthetic compatibility with the local environment. A Traveller site at Clows Top would not be in keeping with the local environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>It is not feasible to develop the land at Clows Top as Traveller site:</b> service water drainage and storm water drainage is not present and</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>installing these facilities would cost at least £800,000 in addition to the costs of clearing up the heavily neglected site. These costs would largely be picked up by developers if it the site would be used for much needed housing development. In order to connect the sewage to Rock or Bayton all involved property owners would in principle need to agree to this and be compensated for the pipes going over their land. It is difficult to see how public support can be attained to make the land suitable for Travellers regardless of whether or not the same site could also be developed for much needed housing. There is a potential for approximately 30 dwellings if this site would to be used for housing development.</p> <p>The prevailing and emerging policies for Traveller, Travelling Showpeople, and Gypsy use state that any site should have adequate access to services and utility infrastructure such as mains water supply and mains electricity. Appropriate arrangements for sewerage treatment must be submitted as part of the application in addition to satisfactory drainage measures. The prevailing and emerging policies for housing list the criteria under which residential development will be permitted. One of the criteria is that the developer must ensure that appropriate sewage/drainage measures are provided.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>The emerging Local Plan policy 8F proposes that to meet the immediate needs of Travelling Showpeople within the District the land at Clows Top should be considered as a potential site for this use and that following allocation, any proposals brought forward should submit suitable arrangements for sewerage treatment in addition to satisfactory drainage measures. As Traveller sites are essentially a residential use, applicants will be required to demonstrate that they have sought a connection to the mains foul sewer in the first instance.</p> <p>The same requirements that apply to residential development must also be met for allocation of a site for Traveller, Showpeople or Gypsy use. Even if exceptions to some requirements could be made to meet the immediate needs of Travelling Showpeople, which we fail to see how this would serve the interest of the local community and, why residential requirements should be eased in any case. Even if certain requirements could be eased this use would be neither suitable nor feasible or attain public support.</p> <p>Policy 8F should be formulated in a way that necessary conditions should be met prior and not subsequent to such an allocation as a site can only qualify as appropriate if all requirements are met. It should also clarify that the same requirements that apply to residential</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>development such as appropriate drainage measures should also be met when allocating a site for Traveller, Showpeople or Gypsy use. If there is a willingness to lower certain standards for this particular use then the standards for housing development should be lowered equally.</p> <p>The prevailing policy <u>DPL10</u>, should also be incorporated in the equivalent emerging <u>policy 19</u> or separately adapted and continued, as this policy contains certain requirements to safeguard appropriate granting of planning permission for this use which have not been incorporated in the aforementioned emerging policy.</p> <p>Given the history and the way this policy is formulated, the impression is created that the intended use is justified by the policy instead of the other way around and that the conflicting potential secondary purpose (Potential Site for Travelling Showpeople) is in reality the primary and currently only purpose (Core Housing Site). Plan Policies are in place not only to guarantee that due process is followed but also to ensure that the limited land and local tax revenues are allocated appropriately. If a short cut is taken in formulation or application one is essentially passing on the immediate allocation issue of one local community to another.</p> <p>If WFDC is serious the about designation of the</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>land at Clows Top as Core Housing Site, then it would be a good idea to coordinate their efforts with The Malvern Hill District Council, which has approved the erection of 30 dwellings adjacent to the A456, and stimulate the process of cooperation between the involved landowners/developers, Severn Trent and the environmental agency to ensure that the appropriate drainage measures are installed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Other locations are (more) suitable for use as Traveller site</b></li> <li>• <b>There is no local support for the use of the land at Clows as Traveller site:</b> Due consideration must be given to the relationship of sites to the surrounding community. It is important to ensure that proposals to develop a site link in with other broader strategies in place for improving community cohesion and be regarded as a key issue within them.</li> </ul> <p>We have seen no evidence of concrete broader strategies in this case promoting to improve community cohesion. There is an immediate housing need, which requires a quick solution. Furthermore, the established community has made it overwhelmingly clear by attendance at public meetings and voicing their opinion in various ways for the past 5 years that they do not wish this community cohesion forced upon them. Many members of the community attended the last Rock Parish Council Meeting</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>on 31 July 2017 to express their opposition and frustration regarding the proposed Traveller site at Clows Top. The Rock Parish Council has also objected in disbelief to the land at Clows Top being in consultation for this use again.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Earmarking the land at Clows Top as Traveller site is in contravention of WFDC broader strategy on sustainability:</b> The emerging Local Plan objectives insofar here relevant are to encourage the long-term sustainable development of Wyre Forest District and its communities and to address housing needs in order that the existing and future residents requirements are met and the economic development of the area is supported. In the emerging Local Plan the allocation of the land at Clows Top as Core Housing Site is confirmed. The broader strategy for accommodating growth in the Wyre Forest Area behind option 7 by allocating more development to the villages and settlements within the District's Rural West is explained further. The consideration of the land at Clows Top as a potential site for Traveller use in the aforementioned emerging Local Plan policy 8F is in contravention of policy 35 and WFDC broader strategy on housing development and community cohesion. If WFDC surrenders the only available and sustainable allocated land in the WFD in this village to this proposed</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>secondary purpose it does not support the broader strategies of WFDC for housing development and communities cohesion in Clows Top. In the assessment of the potential sites for this use the WFDC has recognised that the land at the site at Clows Top is at the heart of a remote rural village, that there is poor public transport links to local urban centres and that such a use does not fit in with the requirements of their Core Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Earmarking the land at Clows Top as Traveller site would disjoint this small settled community:</b> In one form or another, all central government policies express that the interests of the settled community must be respected and local amenities as well as local environment protected. Local planning authorities should ensure that any Traveller site to be considered is sustainable economically, socially as well as environmentally and avoids placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services. Similar provisions can be found in the local policies and guidelines of WFDC. Clows Top is a small village with about 20 dwellings in Rock Parish and about 60 dwellings in Bayton Parish. It simply does not have the infrastructure to support this usage. It would completely dominate the settled community. From this perspective alone, it follows that the site at Clows Top should not be considered now</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>or in the future as potential location for Travelling Showpeople or Gypsy use. Such a usage is not and cannot be made sustainable and would have a destabilising and disjuncting effect on this small settled community. Such a usage would also have an unacceptable impact on the landscape and townscape as well as maintaining and enhancing the community identity. Therefore, the site at Clows Top is not a viable option for this purpose.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>In conclusion, the land at Clows Top is not available nor suitable for this use and it is not feasible nor deemed good governance or socially desirable to develop it for this purpose. Such a purposing is in direct contravention of various components of several local and central policies and government guidelines, not in the least of which WFDC broader strategies for housing development and community cohesion.</p> <p>We trust we have provided sufficient grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to disregard the land at Clows Top from any future considerations as a potential site for Traveller, Showpeople or Gypsy use and thus to reject the potential dual purpose of this land (Core Housing Site or Potential Site for Travelling Showpeople) and maintain the single purpose of</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Core Housing Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• or alternatively to reformulate the emerging Local Plan policy 8F and other related policy items such as paragraph 8.40 in a way that it is clear that the necessary conditions need to be met prior and not subsequent to an allocation for Traveller, Showpeople and/or Gypsy use and that the same requirements that apply to residential development such as that appropriate drainage measures must also be met for allocation of a site for Traveller, Showpeople or Gypsy use or if there is a willingness to lower standards for this use then equally lower the standards for housing development as this will - in the event the Local Plan policy 8F is adopted - still be the preferred use.</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2815</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Strongly objects to the land at Clows Top being classed as a potential site for Travelling Showpeople:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Access in and out of the site for large vehicles and cars towing caravans</b> - entry and exit to the site dangerous</li> <li>• <b>Sewer system</b> - Building land is very hard to source in rural areas. Clows Top has no mains sewer which is the reason this land has never been built on. The village would like this matter resolved so the village can have some affordable</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p> <p>The site is for just one family who are already resident in the District.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>housing for the young of the village. Do Travelling Showpeople not need connection to a mains sewer? If the answer to this question is no they do not need mains sewer then please explain why we cannot build houses on the land under the same rule?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Unstable land</b> - As with most brownfield sites it does need clearing up. What controls will be put in place to ensure the site is cleared and tidied as per regulations. The bank is slipping onto the footpath, if large vehicles are parked on the site the slippage would get worse and houses below the site could be at risk. If the land is used for building the site would have to be cleared according to laws in place at that point in time.</li> <li>• <b>Occupation of Land</b> - Your consultation does not state how many Travelling Showpeople families would live on the site. The impact of Travelling Showpeople on the village is unknown as the number of families wishing to use the site is unknown.</li> </ul> <p>We would like to see affordable homes built in Clows Top so the young of the village and surrounding areas can stay where they were brought up and live near to their relatives.</p> <p>We strongly object to the use of the land as a Travelling Showpeople site.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO2919</a>	Clows Top	Comment	<p>Objects to BR/RO/1 as a potential site for travelling show people.</p> <p>Believes the site is unsuitable because some years ago the yard was subject to a Public Inquiry as it has been created without the necessary permissions being obtained.</p> <p>Responsible authorities do not appear to have enforced the resulting directions of the Public Inquiry. There is a belief that the original construction was undertaken by using unsuitable materials including scrap vehicles.</p> <p>The land is unsuitable as a parking place for large numbers of heavy vehicles.</p> <p>As an alternative, there are former factory sites in Stourport and Kidderminster which would be eminently more suitable for the proposed use, having been properly constructed and more accessible.</p> <p>Problems with main drains in Clows Top - currently residential and business premises have no access to main drains - the dependence on septic tank drainage has caused the local authority to impose conditions on any proposed residential developments that any new builds would need to be connected to main drains.</p> <p>Therefore, the increased use/occupation of this site would necessitate the requirement for appropriate foul</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>drainage provision in line with the local authority requirements to prevent any hazardous environmental damage being caused.</p> <p>Traffic - this has increased in recent years. Pavements provision in this part of the village is less than adequate with an interrupted pavement on only one side of the road. It is hazardous enough at the present time and any increase in the levels of danger and inconvenience to pedestrians and other road users would be unacceptable.</p> <p>Any Local Plan should address the real Community issues that exist, rather than create more detrimental ones.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO3000</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Looking at the various options outlined in the proposals, I would like to comment on the land at Clows Top. As I understand it from the paragraph 8.40, (p65), there should be provision for mains drainage for such a site and there currently is none at Clows Top. The site is also adjacent to village residents and countryside beyond. Although this site is classed as brownfield, access from the A456 in either direction for large heavy goods vehicles transporting large scale fairground equipment could be extremely hazardous. Many users of the A456 do not adhere to the 30 mph speed limit and therefore an entrance and exit to this site could impact detrimentally to the safety of road users and pedestrians at Clows Top.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				Policy 19 - Given the guidelines relating to site safety and standards outlined in Policy 19, again I would comment that Clows Top is unsuitable for a site for travelling show people and their equipment and none of the criteria on which planning permission would be granted applies.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3035</a>	Clows Top	Object	The site being close to the junction of the A456/B4202 is highly inappropriate and dangerous with reduced visibility on a busy road.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3260</a>	Clows Top	Comment	<p>1. We are surprised that consultation does not include neighbouring parishes. In view of the proximity of Lindridge Parish to CLOWS TOP we request that we be included, as stakeholders, in any consultation regarding matters likely to impact on our residents, such as the siting of travellers or show people's caravans or equipment.</p> <p>2. On the present classification BR/RO/1 LAND AT CLOWS TOP:- In view of the existing problem of fast moving HGV and other traffic on the A456, any further increase in use of road by towing or other heavy vehicles should not be recommended. Also we would remind planners that in severe weather, which we have been told to expect more frequently due to climate change, the A456 has often become blocked at CLOWS TOP HILL due to stranded HGVs, therefore it does not seem that the proposal has been adequately tested, as required, to allow for climate change.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3370</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>1) The site is at the top of a very steep hill, close to a busy road junction and due to the site's restrictive access, would create added dangers to traffic</p> <p>2) The turning circle required for large vehicles off the main A456 would be inadequate and cause a danger to other road users and pedestrians.</p> <p>3) This is a Green Belt area and the site would be inappropriate for such a development.</p> <p>4) Clows Top is a settled community, with facilities supporting many neighbouring small villages and this development would conflict with the lifestyle of the current population and have a detrimental effect on the area.</p> <p>5) Such developments should be situated closer to larger settlements where the existing facilities can cope.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3515</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>As residents of Clows Top, we would like to notify you of our objection to the proposed development of a traveller, travelling showpeople or Gypsy site on the former transport yard site at Clows Top as described in the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review Preferred Options consultation documents.</p> <p>Our primary reasons for this objection are listed below:</p> <p>1. That, in 2011, this site was nominated as such at</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>which time the plan was rejected for a number of valid reasons. Issues of noise, incompatibility with the local, rural community, lack of appropriate, safe access to the site, lack of local amenities and the unsuitability of the site for development (see point 2 below) due to lack of drainage and sewerage treatment options were cited at the time as reasons for the rejection of this plan. Since the situation has in no way altered during the intervening time and no modifications have been made to the site it follows that all the above mentioned objections, of which your office is well aware, would still apply.</p> <p>2. The same issues of sewerage and drainage which have so far been one of the key objections to any and all attempts by the site owner to gain planning permission for a housing development both on the transport yard site and the former public house site would entirely apply to the use of the site for travelling show people or Gypsy accommodation. If these issues can be resolved for one proposed use they can just as easily be resolved for the alternative proposed use.</p> <p>3. Clows Top is a small, rural community from which the majority of people travel by road to work in the local towns of Tenbury, Bewdley and Kidderminster or further afield to Birmingham and surrounding areas. As such, the facilities available within the village (Small shop, post</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>office, butcher, village hall) are limited because the majority of highly mobile residents are quite capable of locating and accessing additional services elsewhere. The village does not offer a primary school, GP surgery, public house nor adequate transport links to access these or other facilities apart from by private car. The village is, by definition, currently not well suited to any lifestyle other than that outlined at the beginning of this paragraph. The development of the proposed site for housing would allow additional families with a rural/commuter lifestyle to augment the village population. Such population might very well benefit the small business currently offering facilities within the village. However, these constraints make it obvious that any other settlement other than that outlined would lead to frustration at lack of facilities and a poor quality of life for those forced into such a situation by the limited availability of alternative traveller sites.</p> <p>4. Government policy has, for a long time, been that all residential development should offer mixed accommodation. For the housing developer this means a strictly regimented blend of luxury through to affordable properties. Developing the site in Clows Top as a traveller, show people or gypsy site would, in effect, create a large concentration of a single property type within a very small, rural community</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>lacking the capacity to absorb such a development. Community cohesion is a buzz-word used by councillors but such cohesion would inevitably be a casualty should this development go ahead.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is our contention that development of the former transport yard site for mixed housing could, if designed sensitively and in keeping with the local housing stock and community demographic, be of benefit to the village of Clows Top.</li> <li>• Any objection to the development of the site for housing on the basis of access restrictions to the busy main road (A 465), drainage or sewerage would apply to all residential use of the site including that by travellers, show people or gypsies.</li> <li>• That every objection raised and validated by the rejection of a similar proposal in 2011 still stands.</li> <li>• Any development type considered for this site will have a disproportionate impact upon the community and the village of Clows Top due to its small size and this should be taken into account before any development is approved.</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP04096</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>We are writing with regards to the above proposal as outlined in the Wyre Forest Local Plan Review Preferred Options (June 2017) Policy 8F, on page 64.</p> <p>We wish to object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>very poor access:</b> access from the A456 to the proposed site is very limited and not at all suitable for large, heavy duty transport vehicles and trailers. The turning access into the site is narrow and long vehicles would have to mount the kerb on the opposite side of the road, causing danger to pedestrians, children playing and long term damage to both the road and path infrastructure.</li> <li>• <b>major traffic hazard:</b> the site's access is at the top of a steep incline and the turning point is at the brow of the hill. Large vehicles turning at this point in the road would create a considerable road block, resulting in possible collision with other vehicles travelling in both directions. Traffic through the village would also build up considerably and create traffic jams on what is already a very busy major A road from the West Midlands to mid and west Wales.</li> <li>• <b>poor condition of the land:</b> the local community have been led to believe that the land is not stable, as it was used for the disposal of many materials in decades gone by. This has resulted in insufficient drainage and created an unstable</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>ground for any large heavy vehicles to be stored without possible danger of earth movement and slippage onto the dwellings below this land on Clows Top bank. WFDC would need to invest valuable resources to research this, when they could spend their limited funds in other areas to improve the village facilities.</p> <p>We would also like to ensure that WFDC are aware the area allocated for the proposed provision detailed on the map on appendix a (Villages and Rural West) is incorrect and very misleading, as it gives the impression that the whole area in yellow is being considered as a Potential Site for Travelling Showpeople. Whereas some of this area is owned by Matthews Construction and should indicate accurately its potential for housing.</p> <p>Finally, as this is a 'Brown Field Site' and amongst dwellings, within the village perimeter, we feel WFDC need to consider proposals that ensure the long term sustainability for the village and work with the local community to support the installation of main sewerage, an improved water supply and provide a small number of long term housing options that contribute to village life. If Clows Top is able to develop into a thriving community with more services and a healthy infrastructure, this will enable the village to become a 'community hub' supporting the many hamlets and small villages in its surrounding area that have lost their own local provision over the years.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO4224</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>I object to the land at Clows Top being used for 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 Claws 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</li> </ol>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>to any housing development.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 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="#">LPPO4319</a>	Clows Top	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</li> </ol>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>congestion/very poor visibility at junctions.</p> <p>3. The site is well known for poor and instability due to its previous use for mining /disposal waste metal.</p> <p>4. The infrastructure for this and nearby villages (schools, doctors etc.) are full to capacity.</p> <p>5. Thus I consider the site is only suitable for a small business venture i.e. garage or similar to support local needs.</p>	for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPPO4486</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Object to this site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no mains drainage/sewage.</li> <li>• Poor access with the speed and amount of traffic.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4670</a>	Clows Top	Object	Objects.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO5068</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p><b>Clows Top:</b> Should be kept as a core housing site and not used for travelling /show people.</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</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>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> <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>documents.</p> <p>Note that Malvern Hills District Council has been consulted on the emerging Wyre Forest District Local Plan, and we will continue to consult with them.</p>
Anonymous	<a href="#">LPPO1005</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Objects to the use of this site for Travelling/Show People.</p> <p>This site should instead be developed as affordable housing both for local residents, and to entice new families into the vicinity. This would bring new skills into the area, and help to boost the local economy long-term.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
Chaddesley	<a href="#">LPPO1038</a>	Clows Top	Comment	<p>Only the site at Clows Top is a brownfield site, so this</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
Corbett Parish Council				would seem the preferred option.	
Pensax Parish Council	<a href="#">LPP01086</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Pensax Parish Council supports Clows Top in objecting to land as a potential site for Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>Clows Top and the surrounding Parishes have limited areas on which houses can be built due to the rural landscape.</p> <p>This brownfield site should be used for a mixed housing development to enable local people to have some affordable housing in the area.</p> <p>Site is not suitable for Travelling Showpeople due to access problems for large vehicles and cars towing caravans. Traffic on the A456 has increased considerably over the last 10 years, the speed limit of 30mph is not adhered to by the majority of drivers making entry and exit to this land very dangerous. Near misses are witnessed by residents living in this area of village.</p> <p>Clows Top does not have a main sewer connection, this is essential for housing to be built and would be of benefit to the majority of the houses in the village. It is assumed Travelling Showpeople would require a mains sewer but we note the comment in the consultation document stating they need to 'source a connection' whatever that means, this point needs clarification.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>The land is known to be contaminated with buried items, it is thought this could have made the area unstable in places and large vehicles could cause slippage to occur if they use the site. We are aware this would need to be rectified whatever the site is used for but feel the Travelling Showpeople may not tidy the land up to the required standard before they start using it thus creating a potential hazard for nearby houses below the site.</p> <p>No indication of how many families/caravans the site would be allowed to have so it is difficult to assess the impact this would have on the area.</p> <p>Map in your consultation document is incorrect and is very misleading.</p> <p>Residents of Pensax Parish wish their voice to be heard.</p> <p>Pensax has no land on which building would be allowed and would like to see affordable homes for the next generation built in Clows Top.</p> <p>Pensax Parish Council strongly objects to the use of the land as a Travelling Showpeople site.</p>	
Bayton Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO817</a>	Clows Top	Object	Bayton Parish Council wishes to object to the land at Clows Top being classed as a potential site for Travelling Showpeople.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Site has access problems - not suitable for large vehicles, speeding traffic. No mains sewer in village and clay soil does not allow for good drainage. Would a showpeople site require connection to the mains?</p> <p>Land thought to be contaminated as landfill. Bank unstable so would be hazard for houses below. How many families would live there?</p> <p>Map is incorrect and misleading. We wish to see affordable housing in village not a travelling showpeople site.</p>	<p>included in the pre-submission documents.</p> <p>It is a single family group requiring a new site as outlined in the policy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO508</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>Policy 19 - Site Standards for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Proposals for Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople sites will only be granted planning permission where:</p> <p>i. Comment: At a recent village meeting of up to 100 residents it was clear that providing an area for Travellers and Travelling Showpeople right in the middle of this community would definitely not be "sensitive to the local context".</p> <p>ii. Comment: a. I believe the ground in this area is very unstable and would require considerable work to avoid subsidence down the steeply sloping hillside which</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>would be caused by heavy vehicles.</p> <p>b. Current business vehicle use has been reported by one resident as already causing heavy deterioration where vehicles are joining the main carriageway.</p> <p>iii. Comment: Provision for sewerage is a problem and not available at Clows Top. The current infrastructure (water, electricity) is poor and requires modernisation, this is not planned until after the date for the implementation of this proposal.</p> <p>iv. Comment: With regard to 'and residents [and]* should meet local authority standards'.                      *(I believe this second 'and' in the proposal document is a mistake).</p> <p>c. This is a small community that needs all the help it can get to keep the local businesses supported; Having a travelling community located at Clows Top would be devastating in the problems it would cause.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO672</a>	Clows Top	Object	<p>I would like to object 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> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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="#">LPP0609</a>	Habberley Road	Object	Not suitable	Objection noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01689</a>	Habberley Road	Object	Strongly objects to the proposed travellers' site at Habberley Road, Bewdley; based on personal perception that it might make the area less desirable, affect house prices and could change the quiet Meadow Rise area for the worse. The Heath Hotel could also be affected.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01691</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I oppose plans to use the site in Habberley Road for travelling showpeople:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Heavy traffic</li> <li>Environment issues</li> <li>Effect on to local businesses, Hotel and Golf Course</li> <li>Too close to Habberley Valley which is popular with visitors.</li> </ol>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01692</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I object to the Habberley Road site because:</p> <p>The area is Green Belt</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>It would be degenerative to the area.</p> <p>The road is a very busy and more traffic and large vehicles using the road to gain access/egress from the site would be dangerous.</p> <p>The site could easily be exploited.</p> <p>This area has been refused planning in the past due to its history.</p>	included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO1927</a>	Habberley Road	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>Proposed Travelling Showpeople site would mean large equipment pulling in and out onto the B4190 from a narrow entrance and also from a slight incline.</p> <p>The proposed developments also being on Green Belt land.</p>	Please see above. Any potential development would be considered by Worcestershire CC Highways with mitigation works if required.
	<a href="#">LPPO1929</a>	Habberley Road	Object	I wish to object to the proposed development at Habberley Road.	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO1932</a>	Habberley Road	Object	Objects strongly to this proposed site. Reasons for objection are based on personal perception that there might be damage to the local community, both in the	Objection is noted. Information on the Local Plan was posted to households within the District and advertised

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				value of property, increase in vehicular traffic and most worryingly a potential increase in crime. This latter point has serious implications on an already stretched to the limit a Police Service. Asks if there are alternative appropriate locations.	throughout the District.
	<a href="#">LPP01935</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects to the Habberley road site based on the personal perception that it might have an adverse impact on the appeal of the local hotel as a potential wedding venue and have an impact on the golf course as an area of natural beauty.</p> <p>Bewdley with its heritage and beauty is the real jewel in the crown of Wyre Forest tourism and should be preserved at all costs.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
Bewdley Pines Golf Club	<a href="#">LPP01944</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects to the Habberley Road site for travelling showpeople for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a potential Bronze Age burial mound here. A planning Inspectors ruling was that there should be no encroachment of the area between Kidderminster and Bewdley.</li> <li>• If agreed for Travelling Showpeople its use could not be restricted to one user and would bring potential for multiple living facilities. This would give us concern for the security of our business and could potentially damaging trade and putting jobs at risk.</li> <li>• Highway issues - This site is between two major businesses in the area on an already busy road</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>(B4129) creating greater potential for an incident to occur due to lorries and plant turning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Losing more land that acts as a barrier between Kidderminster and Bewdley</li> <li>• Noise and security issues for local businesses and residents.</li> </ul> <p>Damage to local environment and the economy.</p>	
	<p><a href="#">LPPO2221</a></p>	<p>Habberley Road</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>PROPOSED SITE FOR TRAVELLING SHOW PEOPLE              HABBERLEY ROAD, BEWDLEY              I object as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would severely disrupt the natural land buffer between Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• The size/permanent nature of the site would be a blot on the landscape.</li> <li>• The site is too close to existing homes.</li> <li>• The site is situated within 200 meters of another site proposed for a housing development (WA/BE/5) which must be a priority in Bewdley's development.</li> <li>• Habberley Road is used as a Kidderminster by-pass with levels of traffic are too high for any further developments.</li> <li>• The negative impact on local tourism specifically its location at the entrance to the Mercure Hotel</li> </ul> <p>Consent for the site would pave the way for future</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				developments on adjoining land	
	<a href="#">LPPO2222</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>We object to Habberley Road site for Travelling Show People as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed plan is against planning advice, earlier applications have been refused</li> <li>2. Effect on local businesses</li> <li>3. The B4129 is a busy road making access to/from the site potentially dangerous.</li> <li>4. Other available sites in the area would be more suitable from this point of view</li> </ol>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2355</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I object travellers site on Habberley Road, Bewdley Road already v busy would be worse.</p> <p>Effect on Mercure Hotel.</p> <p>Could affect golf/health club/nearby residents</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2371</a>	Habberley Road	Object	Object to travellers' site Habberley Road site: traffic safety on busy road/ loss of Green Belt which should be protected to stop Bewdley and Kidderminster merging.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2415</a>	Habberley Road	Object	It is my view that the land off Habberley Road, Bewdley is entirely unsuitable for this use as it is inconsistent with	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>the development of Bewdley as an attractive place for visitors and a centre for tourism, especially as this site is so close to Bewdley’s major hotel, as well being inconvenient for shops and other services. It would make more sense to locate this site closer to an area where the travelling show people work.</p>	<p>most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPP02425</a></p>	<p>Habberley Road</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I would like to object to a potential site for Travelling show people the land off Habberley Road, Bewdley. I have reached the decision to object to this plan after much consideration, including the social, environmental and economic reasons.</p> <p>Considering the location of all potential sites the site proposed near Habberly Road is the most heavily populated and therefore immediately appears to be the least suitable. The plan also suggests a large number of houses to be built in Bewdley, especially in the Wribbenhall area. Thus the increase in dwellings will result in a growth in the number of families and transportation in the local area. Therefore, I believe this site is not suitable for the purpose suggested as there would be a further increase to the population of the local area and certainly an increase in the amount of large transportation on the roads.</p> <p>The increase in large transportation on the roads of Bewdley would be a very bad idea. The area is an attraction for many people all over the UK, due to the river, buildings, Seven Valley Railway and West Midlands</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Safari Park. The roads would not be able to withstand more heavy vehicles in the area.</p> <p>Similarly, the addition of a site for Travelling Showpeople would be a disadvantage to the town, due to the noise pollution of the constant storing, and maintaining of fairground rides and show attractions. This would in turn have a negative impact on the town's shops and a dip in property value.</p> <p>Likewise, the addition of a site for Travelling show people in Bewdley would cause strain on the local areas resources. With an increasing number of houses in Bewdley, it is not possible to house any more residents. This would not be fair for the current residents of the small town, as their quality of life should not be affected via this decision.</p> <p>Another wonderful attraction in Bewdley is the Mercure Hotel; from use of a high quality gym to hosting weddings the hotel attracts visitors to the area. I strongly believe the addition of a Travelling Showpeople site opposite the hotel will have a detrimental impact.</p> <p>It seems both unfair on West Midlands Safari Park and Stourport Fun Fair attractions that have supported us, to allow the opening of a travelling show people site so close to these established attractions. Likewise, due to the current presence of both of these attractions, it seems rather unnecessary to host the travelling show</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>people in Bewdley. Surely there is no opportunity in the market anywhere near the Wyre Forest and thus it would be more appropriate for this site somewhere nearer the potential market.</p> <p>In conclusion, I object to the proposal of a policy 8F - Site Provision for Travelling show people of the land off Habberley Road, Bewdley for a variety of reasons.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2429</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I am writing to place a formal notice of objection to the proposed travellers' site on Habberley Road. I disagree totally with your strategic review proposals. The road is already ridiculously busy. This would only become worse with any building or development in the area of Habberley Road. Furthermore, the Mercure offers one of the best venues and places to stay in Bewdley. A traveller's site would undoubtedly impact upon their business. Also concerned about the impact on neighbouring residents. I wish to log my objection to your proposal in the strongest of terms.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2430</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>This proposal needs to be fully explained to the residents of Bewdley. What exactly is proposed for this site? Will it be purely to store circus equipment, or will people be staying there? If the former I object on the grounds of large equipment using Habberley Road and causing congestion on an already busy road and the effect on the environment and if the latter I object to a site for travellers being set up so near to a hotel which brings visitors to the town and surrounding area and will also have an impact on the houses nearby and the</p>	<p>The site was one of 5 consulted on for a specific family of Travelling Showpeople already resident in the district.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				environment.	
	<a href="#">LPP02456</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed Travelling Show People site opposite the Mercure Hotel on the B4190 Habberley Road.</p> <p>This land has been designated as Green Belt land for a good reason, to stop the relentless development of the countryside between Kidderminster and Bewdley. This is a very pretty and important ‘green lung’ for those who live in the area, and there are NO excuses for it to be developed. Planning Inspectors have already ruled that there should be no encroachment into the area.</p> <p>Travelling Show People make up a very small percentage of the travelling community and the number of travelling circuses and fairgrounds cannot warrant using this Green Belt land in such a way. Furthermore there can be no guarantees that the site will not simply become a traveller encampment for any of the Gypsy or Roma community. The environmental impact on this area would be immense. There can be no guarantees that what starts as a traveller site does not rapidly become a settled traveller site, with the erection of static caravans and more permanent dwellings.</p> <p>The access to this site is unsuitable from each direction. The B4190 has become a very busy route between Bewdley and Kidderminster, usually used as a rat-run to avoid congestion along the A456. As the plans are</p>	Please see above. This was not proposed as a site for Gypsy or Travellers but for Travelling Showpeople.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>pushed ahead to further develop the Safari Park site, congestion will increase along the A456, and drivers will naturally seek to use quicker routes such as the B4190. Poor visibility and increased traffic will increase the risk of traffic accidents along this route.</p> <p>Residents who live along Trimpley Lane in Bewdley will see a huge decrease in the value of their property. Who is going to recompense the householders who have to put up with devaluation of property, loss of privacy?</p> <p>It is highly unlikely that the Mercure Hotel will want to remain in business overlooking a travellers' camp. Who would want to come and visit the town to spend their time looking at caravans? How many jobs will be lost if the hotel closes? This area needs every job it can get, but the development of this site will bring no jobs to the area, just multiple problems that have no easy solution.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2545</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I feel that allowing this site to be used for Travelling Show People will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only planning applications with exceptional circumstances should be permitted within the Green Belt and I don't feel this application has exceptional circumstances.</li> <li>• The B4129 is a very busy road and will create highways and traffic issues</li> <li>• There is a high risk that this site will create environmental issues</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a risk this site that could be a risk to local businesses</li> <li>• The cumulative impact on the site would harm the character or appearance of the area and result in an unacceptable impact, especially on the Habberley Valley</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2548</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I wish to lodge my objections on the proposal to allocate the land on the B4129 Habberley Road as a permanent travellers' site. My concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in traffic on an already busy highway causing further delays than normal and an increased risk of accident.</li> <li>• Damage to the local environment.</li> <li>• Blot on the landscape, the local scenery is a thing of beauty and this will be put at risk.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2552</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed “travelling show people” site opposite the Mercure Heath Hotel Bewdley.</p> <p>This area is Green Belt and previous planning applications have been rejected due to;</p> <p>Potential Bronze Age burial mound and</p> <p>No encroachment to the area between Bewdley and</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Kidderminster.</p> <p>In my opinion brownfield sites with existing road links should be considered before proposing Green Belt.</p> <p>Its close location to existing businesses could affect trade, resulting in reduced revenue to the area with a knock on to local employment.</p> <p>The proposed site is of considerable size and would put additional strain on the busy roads around this area. Other sites in the proposed plan offer better road infrastructure to suit the larger vehicles associated with this type of site. I.e. site off Stourport road (A451) adjacent to industrial estate.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPP02555</a>	Habberley Road	Comment	Comments that the site may not be for sale or affordable.	Comment noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP02594</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I wish to strongly object to this proposal on the following principal grounds:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no demonstrable demand for a travellers site in Bewdley.</li> <li>• Developments of this nature should be located close to existing similar developments where the</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>particular issues arising can be more efficiently and effectively monitored by the authorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed site is directly opposite the Heath Hotel and development of the site would damage the attractiveness of this important leisure and tourism facility with the result of a reduction in its use and a potential loss of income and employment.</li> </ul> <p>Taking all these matters into account I request that the Council should not include the Habberley Road site for any development as a site for Travellers in the Local Plan.</p>	<p>The consultation was for a Travelling Showpeople site and the demand for the site is evidenced in the policy.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2650</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects to the Habberley Road site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inappropriate development in the Green Belt. There are other sites under consideration that are not in the Green Belt.</li> <li>It is adjacent to a Bronze Age burial site</li> <li>Traffic. Habberley Road is very busy, almost acting as a bypass from Kidderminster to Bewdley and Stourport. Development at Mecure Hotel, West Midlands Safari Park and South of Habberley Road will cause problems for everyone living along this stretch of road. There is no right turn at Catchems End and the vast majority of people travelling in either direction past this proposed site is 50-60mph and some</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>much faster. This I fear would cause an accident hot spot where ultimately fatalities could occur with heavy show machinery entering and leaving the proposed site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site is not previously developed land.</li> <li>• There is an abundance of wildlife in the surrounding woods and fields, including deer, badgers, falcons, sparrow hawks and owls, rabbits and squirrels, which would be displaced by allowing such development to go ahead. I also understand there may be some BOP flora which I am unsure of whether this is protected or not, perhaps you could have someone let me know.</li> <li>• There are three more desirable locations: Rear of Ceramaspeed which is owned by the Council; Heath Lane which is already owned by the family; Clows Top which is already in use.</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2666</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I quote from your document 19.4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "where possible Gypsy and Traveller sites should be developed near to housing as part of mainstream residential development"</li> <li>• " traveller site development in open countryside should be strictly limited"</li> <li>• " the site should give adequate consideration for towing caravans to enter, exit and manoeuvre</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>around the site"</p> <p>Habberley road is a fast moving road with a 50 mph section. It is very busy especially in at rush hour as it links Stourbridge, Hagley Wolverhampton, Bridgnorth with Stourport and Worcester without the need to pass through Kidderminster.</p> <p>The site is rural in nature and there is a series of bends at one end of the road - the land falls away from the road and the road itself has only two lanes.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2893</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>this proposal is for one family in particular, it would not restrict other travelling show people from using the site. This means that the amount of people and vehicles on the site could grow which in turn will cause more issues to the area including potentially damaging trade of local businesses and damage to the local environment.</p> <p>It will also bring problems to traffic flow as access to and from the site from Habberley Road is not suited to large vehicles coming and going.</p>	The site allocation is for one family of Travelling Showpeople currently resident in the District.
	<a href="#">LPPO3038</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objections towards the proposed traveller sites in the plan on the B4129 Habberley Road in Bewdley.</p> <p>1. The site will be open to all travelling show people/travellers causing constant movement of traffic on and off the site. This will be extremely dangerous given it is a rural road with lots of properties and houses</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>with families so the noise at all hours would also be unacceptable.</p> <p>2. The B4129 is a rural road which has become busy over the years and with the potential extra traffic, will make it a very dangerous road with accidents waiting to happen.</p> <p>3. If this plan goes ahead, the hotel and golf club will suffer, causing damage to their businesses.</p> <p>4. The development will result in damage to the local environment which is a beautiful area. Wild life will suffer.</p> <p>5. All of the residents who live on this road will be affected by the noise of the travelling community. It will adversely affect the property values.</p> <p>6. The idea of the site is already causing bad feeling in the area and there are bound to be negative tensions if this is given the go ahead.</p> <p>7. There are plenty of brownfield sites available in other larger towns that would be more suitable.</p> <p>8. Tourism would also be affected.</p> <p>9. It further erodes the rural space between Bewdley and Kidderminster which is supposed to be protected to</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				maintain the separate identities of the towns.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3232</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>We DO NOT support the proposal for a transitional travellers site at Habberley Road.</p> <p>The site sits within the Green Belt and is adjacent to a hotel and residential properties</p> <p>The local roads, particularly the corner at Catchems End does not lend itself to coping with fairground attractions etc which are transported on huge vehicles.</p> <p>Spoil the beauty of the green space. Worried about litter left.</p> <p>Furthermore, with a permanent site already in nearby Stourport on Severn, it makes so much more sense to develop a site in Stourport, rather than create a huge ongoing and potentially dangerous traffic problem on a busy, much used B road in Bewdley.</p>	The proposal was for Travelling Showpeople and would be a permanent location for a family already resident in the District.
	<a href="#">LPPO3432</a>	Habberley Road	Object	I feel that this land should be used affordable housing for the young people of Bewdley, and not for strangers to the town, there are community housing being built in the area, but the young are unable to purchase these if they are over a certain pay bracket, so youngsters who are in this situation are unable to purchase new properties, as they are either in the higher unaffordable range or the lower which they are unable to purchase	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				There is enough traffic on the Habberley Road without the comings and goings and mess of travellers, why not put it in Stourport or Kidderminster.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3558</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>The site is in close proximity to popular businesses, Bewdley Pines Golf Course and The Heath Hotel which is the main hotel for tourists to the Georgian Town of Bewdley. The popular visitor site of Habberley Valley with its interesting flora and fauna is also nearby.</p> <p>There is doubt that the site could be used for sole occupancy which could lead to a large development on Green Belt land.</p> <p>Other proposed sites have the infrastructure to cope with large trailers and lorries and would be more suitable for purpose.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3565</a>	Habberley Road	Object	I wish to object under section 19 of the potential site for show people on the B4190 opposite the Mercure hotel Habberley Road Bewdley, Against previous planning advice Site would be open to ALL travelling people Highway issues Damage to local environment.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3742</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>Previous planning rulings on this area, Green Belt erosion.</p> <p>Use could not be restricted to one operator thus opening the need for living facilities.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				Highways issues.  Potential damage to local businesses.  Environmental damage.	
	<a href="#">LPP04000</a>	Haberley Road	Object	I strongly object to the use of the land opposite the Heath hotel as a site for travelling show people. When the Safari Park has an event the traffic blocks access to Trimpley Lane and Catchems End thus affecting Haberley Valley Road. Traffic is backed up at Catchems End when flooding occurs. Extra people and vehicles will make it even more difficult to turn out of Trimpley Lane. The B4129 is unsuitable for large vehicles. The community, hotel and gymnasium would be negatively affected.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP04022</a>	Haberley Road	Object	I wish to object to the proposed travelling showpeople site on Haberley Road in Bewdley for the following reasons.  (1) Whilst the site is similar in size to one where 45 dwellings are proposed, it is naive to think that it is for one temporary user and would become an invitation to others to come to the site.  (2) Having already been turned down for previous planning applications on several grounds, it seems a strange decision to now propose this development.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>(3) Historically local businesses suffer when such a development is allowed and there are several businesses close to the proposed site.</p> <p>(4) Bewdley is a town which relies heavily on tourism, and the potential negative impact on local businesses and the community seem disproportionate to the benefit of supporting a single travelling showperson.</p> <p>Please do not allow this to proceed.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO4092</a>	Habberley Road	Object	With regards to the showpeople's site, this will destroy the area, and as the area is exposed it is not the right area for storage and living. The visual impact of the present site is terrible. Transport this to the proposed site and the visual effect will be horrific. In a critical area of Green Belt, it is also situated on a far stretch of road opposite an important tourist hotel (Ramada).	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4094</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>We wish to strongly object to the proposal of having a traveller site on Habberley road. It will bring disruption to the area as well as loss of business to the Ramada hotel and the other businesses within the hotel.</p> <p>It will bring damage to the local environment and many highway issues.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4095</a>	Habberley Road	Object	I am writing to object to the proposal of siting a provision for travelling show people at Habberley Road	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Bewdley.</p> <p>My reasons for objecting are the following :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bewdley survives on tourism, so this will be a huge negative factor for attracting tourists to the town.</li> <li>2. The proposed site is Green Belt.</li> <li>3. Traffic implications at the already over loaded Catchems End Junction and this would no doubt make matters worse.</li> <li>4. Most sites for travellers are located in Stourport which has probably developed ways of coping with the influx of travellers in schools and GP surgeries and social services.</li> </ol> <p>Surely therefore it would be more logical to locate this site on Land within Wilden Top Area of Development Restraint. This is also the largest area of land so would allow better planning.</p>	<p>included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPP04108</a></p>	<p>Haberley Road</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>POTENTIAL SITE FOR TRAVELLING SHOW PEOPLE</p> <p>I write to object to this site being included for the local Plan Review for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The site does not meet the necessary requirements as laid out PPTS(2012) and quoted in para 8.49 of the Council Plan and sites located in the Green Belt are inappropriate</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites adjacent to this land have been previously subject to planning applications and the planning inspectors ruling was that there should be no encroachment of the area. The land is also of historical and wildlife importance and is near to visitor attractions such as Habberley Valley and Wassell Wood.</li> <li>• The negative effect this site might have on The Heath Hotel and Bewdley Pines Golf Club could result in loss of business and jobs and less tourism would impact very badly on other smaller businesses in the attractive Georgian town of Bewdley.</li> <li>• There is a serious Highways issue to consider. The B4129 is not suitable for heavy duty traffic which Show People would use. It is a very busy road where fatalities have occurred in recent years. The turn at Catchems End is often a bottleneck and large vehicles would have difficulty manoeuvring there.</li> <li>• The question arises that the site could not be used for sole occupancy and could eventually become a large site for Travelling Show People and would the Council be able to afford the upkeep and supervision of the site.</li> <li>• Other proposed sites appear to be very much more suitable (e.g. Kidderminster and Stourport) as the infrastructure is already in place and certainly the development of one of these would</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				raise less environmental issues.	
	<a href="#">LPP04706</a>	Habberley Road	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>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>	Objection noted.
	<a href="#">LPP04849</a>	Habberley Road	Object	We object to this site for use by a travelling show-people for storage and accommodation. I believe it is inappropriate of this land use in the Green Belt as the site has significant landscape value.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPP0937</a>	Habberley Road	Object	We oppose the site at Habberley Road, Bewdley. This is in the Green Belt between Bewdley and Kidderminster. This is a strategic gap keeping the two towns apart and should not be eroded. The other sites are probably acceptable as Travelling Show people's yards.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
					documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO652</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>Site located on a busy link road between Bewdley/Bridgnorth/Wolverhampton. A prominent site within a narrow strip of Green Belt, development here would inevitably lead to pressure to release the remaining Green Belt along the B4190 for development.</p> <p>Siting of fairground rides and equipment for significant parts of the year will be an unsightly incursion into what is now a beautiful landscape flanked by the ancient Wassell Wood.</p> <p>A more discrete location for this facility would be somewhere within the site of the now defunct Trimpley Gold Club which would also be very close to where this community of show people now reside.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO342</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>The potential site for travelling show people at Habberley Road, Wribbenhall, Bewdley (WA/BE/6) is inappropriate. The site is situated in open countryside forming part of the Green Belt. It is opposite a substantial size hotel with leisure facilities which already generates significant traffic turning on and off the B4190 at the same point. The access to the site is quite steep for HGV's and is at 90 degrees to the highway making it awkward for turning into or exiting the site. Moving showground equipment often involves towing trailers behind HGV's and this would cause a significant hazard at the entrance to this site on a very busy "B" road. Although there is a 40mph speed limit this is regularly</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				ignored by bikes. There is no foul sewer drainage close by.	
	<a href="#">LPO367</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>As a nearby resident to the proposed travellers' site opposite the Mercure Hotel in Bewdley I would like to object to this proposal. This location is a very poor option. Bewdley is a rural area that should be preserved without encouraging green space to be used for this sort of development.</p> <p>The road network around this site would be poor, the road access is from a busy road which has historically had a number of accidents, some fatal. The junction at Catchems end is unsuitable for large travelling showpeople's vehicles to negotiate and this would need investment to change the junction. Also, as these vehicles try to manoeuvre into the proposed site they would cause a danger to other road users on this fast road.</p> <p>The location of this site would be unsightly to local residents and I am sure would impact on the trade at the Mercure hotel; their residents would not want to be near to such a site.</p> <p>This location I believe has a planning ruling on it that no encroachment onto the area between Kidderminster and Bewdley should take place due to a potential bronze age burial mound so again this is not a suitable site.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				Despite being earmarked for travelling showpeople it is clearly evident that once used for this sort of development it would enable living facilities for travellers to the site, something that is not required in such a prominent rural site in Bewdley. A more commercial type site would be better suited such as the Stourport or Kidderminster proposal.	
	<a href="#">LPPO368</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I would like to submit an objection to the proposed gypsy site on Habberley Road, Bewdley. I do not think this site is fitting of the surroundings. It is a Green Belt area, close to beautiful woods. This area should not be considered. By essence of being a traveller or gypsy they should not have a permanent site. There are more suitable sites in Stourport and Kidderminster that would suit. Or even the site used previously along the River Severn by black stone. At least it's not to near residential areas.</p> <p>Approving this application would set a precedent and open the surrounding areas to be subject to similar planning applications.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO1792</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects due Habberley site for travelling showpeople due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Travellers vehicles can be 60ft long with lorry and trailers combined. Difficult junction to negotiate at Catchems End.</li> </ol>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>2. The twisting bends coming down the hill towards Habberley Valley are very dangerous even for motor cars.</p> <p>3. The road is not very wide and traffic is now tenfold over the past years.</p> <p>4. Cars and motor bikes exceed the speed limit past our property.</p> <p>5. Drivers do not anticipate the bends, exit points or other hazards hence the accidents that occur.</p> <p>6. Concerns for cyclists, tractors and horse riders.</p> <p>7. Litter is another problem with vehicles discarding rubbish, let's not add to it.</p> <p>8. The properties surrounding this site will be down graded in value and this is not acceptable.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2813</a>	Habberley Road	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</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>large heavy vehicles and there is already traffic congestion from the Safari Park.</p> <p>There are many proposed options but I think many more solutions could be found and used rather than just going straight to Green Belt land.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO3510</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>The B4129 is not suitable for the access of heavy vehicles. Already a busy road the turning of such large vehicles on and off the proposed site will cause safety issues.</p> <p>No means of limiting the impact of increased traffic in the area.</p> <p>The site is opposite a key tourist business for the area. The location of such a site so close to the hotel runs the very real risk of damaging the hotel's ability to attract visitors.</p> <p>Many local residents have invested heavily in the area and will reconsider if the surrounding area is significantly altered.</p> <p>Additional pollution in the area, the loss of natural habitat for the wildlife and the potential damage to a bronze age burial mound.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3538</a>	Habberley Road,	Object	<p>We believe the potential traveller site on the Habberley road would be a mistake as it would have an adverse</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
		Bewdley		impact on the appeal of the local hotel as a potential wedding venue and golf course as an area of natural beauty.	most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4151</a>	Habberley Road, Bewdley	Object	<p>1/ Habberley Road - WA/BE/6</p> <p>My reasons for objections are;</p> <p>*A permanent site for travelling show people on the areas the above proposed sites would mean too great a difference in terms of the land's current and proposed intended use and in relation to the drastic difference compared with the use of the existing surrounding area i.e. one of Bewdley Town's established hotel with leisure facilities, established golf course, private dwellings and one of the areas aesthetically attractive tourist attractions.</p> <p>I have not had time to check but could this be in contradiction of Wyre Forest District Councils planning departments own strict guidelines regarding refusal of planning permission on the grounds of change of use?</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</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>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 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</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>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="#">LPPO4155</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>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 Mecure 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.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4174</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I would like to strongly object to the proposals laid out for Bewdley in the local plan review.</p> <p><u>Traveller site in Bewdley: (ref 8.36)</u> Residents recently</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				protested to any plans to bring traveller sites into Bewdley, once again I must site the visual impact on a main gateway to this beautiful conservation area that a traveller site will bring. The site is also opposite one of the main hotels.	included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4180</a>	Habberley Road	Comment	<u>Bewdley – Potential Travellers Site</u>  WA/BE/6 – Habberley Road. I support the development of dedicated sites for travellers, and initially I thought this was a reasonable allocation. But now I wonder whether there may be a downside to having it virtually opposite the proposed new housing allocation south of Habberley Road (WA/BE/5).	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4183</a>	Habberley Road	Object	Object to the proposed Traveller site on Habberley Road, even if it is just for storage of Fun Fair equipment. It is almost opposite to the Mercure Hotel and would not be conducive to their environment, clientele or business.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4192</a>	Habberley Road	Object	Specifically in relation to Bewdley the site on the Habberley Road - for travelling showpeople would represent a significant intrusion into the green gap between Bewdley and Kidderminster.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO829</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<b>Site WA/BE/6 policy 8F Habberley Road:</b> Object to this site for use by travelling show-people for storage and	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				accommodation. The use is a wholly inappropriate use in the Green Belt. The size and scale of vehicles and rides involved in the use would destroy the openness and have a very deleterious impact on the area's bucolic character and its tourism value generally.	most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01791</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects to development on the Habberley Road site due to:</p> <p>The hotel brings in a lot of tourism to Bewdley and concern that business would be lost if the proposed site goes ahead.</p> <p>The site is of great interest as is the surrounding area due to the archaeological value.</p> <p>The site is close to Habberley Valley which again is a tourist attraction.</p> <p>Suggests the Ceramaspeed site as a preferable location with easier road access.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01963</a>	Habberley Road	Object	The show travellers site area. This does appear to be very close to the small town of Bewdley that draws many visitors from outside the area. Also it will be opposite the Mercure hotel which again draws visitors to the area. The very fact such a site would exist could encourage visitors to go elsewhere. Small rural towns like Bewdley rely very much on purposeful visitors and passing trade. The small market traders that come into	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Bewdley could be deterred from trading in Bewdley. There are already as I understand areas within a not too greater distance of Bewdley that has provision for show and travelling people. I'm sure many objections would be against the removal of Green Belt land, of which there are already decreasing acres around the growing town of Bewdley. There are many areas within and just outside the main town of Kidderminster that are not Green Belt and crying out for regeneration and where school provision and medical provision is more readily available. The infrastructure of such a large town is more able to cope with demand that would be made by the movement of show travelling people and extensive housing than small towns and by the use of the ever daily decreasing use of our precious Green Belt land.</p> <p>It could be a major catastrophe allowing slow turning vehicles pulling caravans off and onto a site on that land.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2176</a>	Habberley Road	Object	<p>I wish to object for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous planners ruled that there should be no encroachment of the area between Bewdley and Kidderminster. Also there is potentially a bronze age burial mound according to study of its planning history.</li> <li>• Site would be open to all travelling show people and would not be restricted to one user.</li> <li>• Use of this site for this would undoubtedly damage local business which would reduce</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>much needed revenue coming into the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are highways issues as this area already suffers heavy congestion as is now. Large vehicles would cause a dangerous aspect on such a busy road. Costly road restructuring would be required.</li> <li>• Damage to the environment due to building, increase in traffic - mostly big diesel lorries causing air pollution.</li> </ul> <p>All in all a not very thought out local plan for Bewdley residents.</p>	
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPPO828</a>	Habberley Road	Object	Bewdley Town Council opposes the potential allocation of land off Habberley Road as a site for travelling showpeople (WA/BE/6 and Policy 8F). There is no requirement for this in the GTAA and the call for sites document references the site's proximity to a hotel and a golf course. This location is therefore not suitable due to its tourism value and poor access to the site for large fairground vehicles either through the town centre or using the junction at Catchems End if using the bypass	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3251</a>	Habberley Road	Comment	<p>Travellers' site at Habberley Road Traffic problems with large vehicles would arise. Narrow Roads for large vehicles.</p> <p>Local business would be affected.</p>	Comment noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP01589</a>	Habberley Road	Object	More people will create too much traffic.  New Road is already blocked off due to difficulty in crossing.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP03413</a>	Heath Lane	Object	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.	Objection noted.
	<a href="#">LPP04669</a>	Heath Lane	Support	Supports.	Support noted.
	<a href="#">LPP04676</a>	Heath Lane	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.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPP04685</a>	Heath Lane	Object	I would like to oppose the Gypsy and Travellers site at Heath Lane (due to the very difficult nature and width of the road structures in that location).	Objection noted.
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	<a href="#">LPP01207</a>	Heath Lane	Object	Land at Heath Lane should not be considered - Green Belt; Access issues, Neighbour issues (Islamic College) etc - this is not an appropriate site	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
Worcestershire	<a href="#">LPP01055</a>	Heath	Object	We note that a site off Heath Lane, Stone is considered	Objection noted. The proposed sites

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
Wildlife Trust		Lane		in this policy. The hedges in this site are known to hold nesting corn buntings (a species of principle importance listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006) and any allocation here would need to take this into account and offer sufficient buffering space to maintain the population into the future. It seems very unlikely that this relatively small site can provide sufficient space to do this and so we would strongly recommend that it is not taken forward at this stage. In this regard we draw your attention to comments in paragraph 8.40 of the consultation document. Moreover it is important to recognise that any allocation here may have an in-combination effect on corn buntings in light of the potential for allocations to the east of Kidderminster proposed under Option A.	continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2314</a>	Heath Lane, Stone	Object	Policy 8F - Heath Lane Stone. This lane is a tight single track and unsuitable for large vehicles.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4314</a>	Heath Lane, Stone	Object	I strongly object to the proposed gypsy, traveller and travelling show people site at Heath Lane as impractical and dangerous due to the nature and size of the surrounding roads.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4313</a>	Land at	Object	<b>Objects to proposed traveller site at Clows Top.</b>	Objection noted. The proposed sites

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
		Clows Top		Believes that the proposed conflicting dual purpose (Core Housing Site or Potential Site for Travelling Showpeople) is not conducive to the development of housing in Clows Top.	continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01481</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	Object	<p>Objections to the proposed site at Clows Top Garage for the use of travellers show people.</p> <p>Potential use of heavy equipment with access causing an increase to traffic to the area causing safety concerns.</p> <p>A preferred option would be housing for the local community.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01487</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	Object	<p>Objections to the proposed site at Clows Top Garage for the use of travellers/show people.</p> <p>Potential use of heavy equipment with access causing an increase to traffic to the area causing safety concerns.</p> <p>Would prefer the proposed site to be allocated for development of affordable housing which would better serve the local community.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01494</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	Object	<p>Objects to the site being used for travellers/show people on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate drainage</li> <li>• Site would be better used for housing</li> <li>• It will be difficult for large vehicles to use the</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>site and dangerous for other road users/cyclists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May deter building of appropriate future housing which Clows Top is in need of</li> </ul> <p>Would prefer to see the site used for housing rather than travellers/show people.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPP01507</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	Object	<p>It is a shame that the land cannot be used for houses to help local people stay in the area. The map used is not correct! <u>Worrying!</u></p> <p>No detail on use of site.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01508</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	Object	<p>It is a shame that the land cannot be used for houses to help local people stay in the area. The map used is not correct!</p> <p>Is the site safe enough to take heavy weight?</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01557</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would prefer housing to be developed.</li> <li>• More houses would secure the future of local school, shops etc.</li> <li>• Safety concerns with the access location - especially for large vehicles and especially in winter months.</li> <li>• Concerns about extra noise and further demands on current infrastructure.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns about the site being safe enough to take heavy weight.</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPPO1558</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would prefer housing to be developed.</li> <li>More houses would secure the future of local school, shops etc.</li> <li>Safety concerns with the access location - especially for large vehicles and especially in winter months.</li> <li>Concerns about extra noise and further demands on current infrastructure.</li> <li>Concerns about the site being safe enough to take heavy weight.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4315</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	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. is 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</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				rather than travelling show people.	
	<a href="#">LPPO4316</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	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>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4317</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	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> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01460</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to site A456</li> <li>- Speed of traffic</li> <li>- No main drainage</li> <li>- Map is incorrect</li> <li>- No detail on use of site</li> <li>- No indication of number of families on site</li> <li>- This is already a dangerous crossroad A456/B4202.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01465</a>	Land at Clows Top BR-RO-1	Object	<p>Objecting to traveller/show people proposal at Clows top on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited visibility on exit of proposed site.</li> <li>• A456 is already dangerous due to speeding - adding heavy vehicles pulling in and out on this road will increase the risk of danger.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Location already sees large vehicles mounting pavements for access causing erosion.</li> </ul> <p>Would prefer something for the community or low cost housing for locals.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO3154</a>	Land at former Clows Top Garage, Clows Top	Object	<p>Object to Clows Top site for travelling showpeople because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual impact.</li> <li>Large equipment exiting the yard onto already dangerous cross-roads.</li> <li>Noise</li> <li>Drainage problems due to lack of mains drainage.</li> <li>Local primary schools already running at capacity.</li> <li>We do not object to the original approval of using the site for a housing development, which we feel would complete and enhance the village.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO1581</a>	Land at Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects based on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The road from High Habberley to Bewdley is dangerous already without the addition of many vehicles towing trailers and caravans.</li> <li>Perception that the site may have a negative impact on local residents due to devaluation of</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. This site was identified for Travelling Showpeople not Travellers.</p> <p>The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				homes and impact on the local hotel.	documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01582</a>	Land at Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is Green Belt land and shouldn't be developed.</li> <li>• Against previous planning.</li> <li>• Highways issues.</li> <li>• Could open more opportunities to develop on Green Belt land.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01584</a>	Land at Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential bronze age burial mound.</li> <li>• Should be no encroachment of the area between Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• If this site was agreed for use by travelling show people its use could not be restricted to one user thus giving potential use for living facilities.</li> <li>• Highway issues with large vehicles turning on and off site on already busy road.</li> <li>• Could damage trade of 2 businesses near by which bring in much needed revenue.</li> <li>• Environmental issues.</li> <li>• Other sites more suitable.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP01590</a>	Land at Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already busy road - especially at peak times.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Important to preserve bronze age burial mound site and not subject this burial site to vandalism.</li> <li>• Adjacent to this ground is private ground where horses are kept.</li> <li>• Road junction Trimpley Lane and Habberley Road (B4129) already narrow and subject to long delays exiting and entering to Meadow Rise estate.</li> <li>• Too isolated to be policed properly or supervised environmentally.</li> </ul>	for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO1593</a>	Land at Habberley Road	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential bronze age burial mound.</li> <li>• Should be no encroachment of the area between Bewdley and Kidderminster.</li> <li>• If this site was agreed for use by travelling show people its use could not be restricted to one user thus giving potential use for living facilities.</li> <li>• Highway issues with large vehicles turning on and off site on already busy road.</li> <li>• Could damage trade of 2 businesses near by which bring in much needed revenue.</li> <li>• Environmental issues.</li> <li>• Other sites more suitable.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO1588</a>	Land at Habberley	Object	Objects due to a personal perception that:	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
		Road		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will deter people from The Mecure Hotel, attending the flower show in September and using The Pines Golf Club facilities.</li> <li>Already busy road.</li> <li>Traffic will only get worse.</li> </ul>	most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO4417</a>	Land at Heath Lane, Stone	Object	<p>I am concerned about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That the gypsy/traveller site is impractical in view of the lane being too narrow for large vehicles.</li> </ul>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2307</a>	Land off Habberley Road, Bewdley	Object	Object to site for travelling people.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO1755</a>	Land within Wilden Top	Object	<p>Long term local residents objecting to the proposals to build on land near their home. Lorries speeding daily. It' a rural area and they are concerned about bringing more traffic to the area and the impact it will have on their stress levels.</p> <p>Preferred site for housing is the site in Stone as it's away from people.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP03613</a>	Land within Wilden Top	Object	MI/21 – Wilden Top Classed as commercial?  Residents assured that no more travellers/showmen sites would be allowed in Stourport; housing would be more appropriate.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01524</a>	Policy 8F	Comment	No comments.	No comments made.
	<a href="#">LPP02771</a>	Policy 8F	Object	We would like to bring to your attention that - perhaps unintended - the emerging policies 8F and 19 appear to be watered down in formulation compared to the equivalent prevailing policies SAL.DPL9 and SAL.DPL10 (titled: Wyre Forest District Council Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan 2006-2026 - Adopted July 2013).  <b>Policy 8F</b>  As Traveller, Travelling Showpeople, and Gypsy sites are essentially a residential use, the same requirements that apply for residential use, such as appropriate sewage and drainage arrangements, must also be met for this use. However, emerging policy 8F paragraph 8.40 suggests that applicants will only be required to demonstrate they have sought a connection to the mains foul sewer in the first instance and therefore the present wording seems to imply that appropriate sewage/drainage measures to residential standards do	Comments noted. We will ensure the pre-submission documents are compliant with the NPPF and PPG and policies previously included in the last Local Plan therefore require revision.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>not necessarily need to be provided for this purpose.</p> <p><b>Policy 19</b></p> <p>Furthermore, it appears to us that the emerging planning permission policy (19) for Traveller, Travelling Showpeople, and Gypsy use on land that is not currently allocated for this use is much less strictly formulated than the equivalent prevailing policies as certain requirements to balance conflicting interests and to protect the interest of the settled community, such as SAL.DPL9 under i-viii and sequential test and SAL.DPL10 under part 1 sub i-viii and part 3, are not repeated in Policy 19.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would it not be preferable to clarify in Policy 8F that the same requirements that apply to residential development, such as appropriate drainage measures, should also be met when allocating a site for Traveller, Showpeople or Gypsy use?</li> <li>2. Also, should Policy 8F not be formulated in a way that all necessary conditions should be met prior and not subsequent to such an allocation as a site can only qualify as appropriate if all requirements are met?</li> <li>3. As per Policy 8F, would it not be preferable to clarify in Policy 19 that this use is</li> </ol>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>predominantly residential with all its consequences?</p> <p>4. Furthermore, is it not preferable to incorporate all requirements of the prevailing policies SAL.DPL9 and SAL.DPL10 in the equivalent emerging Policy 19 assuming that there is no intention to water down the current criteria in balancing conflicting interests?</p>	
	<a href="#">LPP03350</a>	Policy 8F	Object	Sites for 'travelling show people'. Confine next to 'existing gypsy & traveller sites' on Sandy Lane Industrial Estate.	Objection noted.
	<a href="#">LPP04668</a>	Policy 8F	Comment	Comments that finding appropriate sites in the district for Travelling Showpeople is very important.	Comments noted.
Historic England	<a href="#">LPP01271</a>	Policy 8F	Comment	Policy 8E relates to potential development sites for Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation - what assessment has been undertaken as to the impact for the historic environment? How will these issues and opportunities be included within the Plan? This comment also relates to Policy 8F.	A Heritage Impact Assessment Study is being prepared and will be published at pre-submission stage. This study considers the sites and the potential heritage impacts. The purpose of the Heritage Impact Assessment is to support the Local Plan by demonstrating how the historic environment has been considered in the site selection process and to assess the likely impact on heritage assets, (both designated and non-designated) and whether any impact can be mitigated.
	<a href="#">LPP02746</a>	Policy 8F	Object	Believes that there will almost certainly be a negative	Objection noted. The proposed sites

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
		Clows Top		<p>impact on local house prices.</p> <p>Questions the obligations of the local authority.</p> <p>In summary, strongly objects to this proposal and urges WFDC to heed the objections and concerns of residents, and those residents of adjacent communities.</p>	<p>continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p> <p>The site was one of 5 consulted on for a specific family of Travelling Showpeople already resident in the district.</p>
	<a href="#">LPO1827</a>	Policy 8F - Clows Top	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 would also be residing on the premises. There would be an issue with connecting to mains drainage.</li> <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</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				would be put to far better use if a small housing site was proposed.	
	<a href="#">LPPO1957</a>	Policy 8F - Clows Top	Object	<p>Clows Top is a small rural village and I don't think it would be appropriate to add a community that would be travelling. It would unsettle what is a settled community. Clows Top is already difficult in terms of traffic and large vehicles turning into and out of this site is a potential risk to all road and pavement users. I imagine that there could also be a noise problem.</p> <p>I do not think that Clows Top is an appropriate site to house the equipment, people and their accommodation and hope that this proposal is rejected by the Council.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3017</a>	Policy 8F - Clows Top	Object	<p>We would like to object strongly to the proposed traveller's site in the Clows Top Village Hall car park.</p> <p>A traveller's site would also put pressure on the local school which is already running at full capacity.</p> <p>We do not think that it is a good site because of it being near a busy cross roads.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3498</a>	Policy 8F - Clows Top site	Comment	<p>I am writing to express my concern at the possible new Travelling Show people site opposite The Mercure Hotel in <b>Bewdley</b>.</p> <p>My main concern is the thought of lorries towing caravans and trailers turning onto what is an already</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>busy road. It is an accident waiting to happen. While I am opposing this I wish to also show the same concern for the other suggested site at <b>Clows Top</b> for exactly the same reason. I was a resident of Clows Top for many years and I was heavily involved with the renovation and upkeep of the village hall. As with the Habberley Road site, it would be potentially dangerous to have such large vehicles entering and exiting on such busy roads.</p> <p>If these sites are opened, is it then opening the flood gates for more and more travelling families and their vehicles to use these sites? I understand they need to make a living and need somewhere to live but I also care about where I live and it really is a beautiful part of the country. It shouldn't be blighted by the sight of these large vehicles randomly coming and going, and possibly growing in community size over time.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2715</a>	Policy 8F Habberley Road	Object	<p>One reason is that it is too close to legitimate homes.</p> <p>Another is that there is a proposal to build new houses in that area and a traveller's site would seriously bring prices of those down immediately.</p>	The site was proposed for Travelling Showpeople.
	<a href="#">LPPO2719</a>	Policy 8F Habberley Road	Object	Due to the proposed expansion of West Midlands Safari Park, nearby, the amount of traffic using the road network will increase. Therefore, adding the traveller site to the proposed area would cause further congestion with their large vehicles.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Access at Catchem’s End and Kidderminster Road junction is unsuitable for large long vehicles in both directions.</p> <p>Access to and from the Habberley Road site could prove to be an accident area.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2621</a>	Policy 8F - Habberley Road	Object	<p>I object strongly to this policy for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No market for this as we already have the West Midlands Safari Park and the Stourport fair.</li> <li>• More traffic in our quaint little town.</li> <li>• Diminish the atmosphere and respectability of Bewdley.</li> <li>• More rubbish.</li> <li>• It's an eye sore along with light and noise pollution.</li> <li>• Stretching the school system as well as the medical centre beyond its limits.</li> <li>• May attract undesirable characters to Bewdley.</li> <li>• Drop in tourism.</li> <li>• The Mecure will suffer.</li> <li>• Lower house prices.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO414</a>	Policy 8F - Habberley Road	Object	<p>The Habberley Road site proposal for Travelling Showpeople poses a number of negative aspects:-</p> <p>1. The approach along Habberley Road would create a potential accident 'Black-spot' being directly opposite</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>the Mercure Hotel entrance and just over a blind bend/rise on what become a very busy road. This road is also difficult to access from either north or south for large vehicles.</p> <p>2. This Green Belt land offers a sensible buffer between Kidderminster and Bewdley, we should really attempt to avoid the potential of closing the distances between populations.</p> <p>3. The site also has local historical interest being identified as bronze age links, similar to Wassell Wood and the roman sites of interest below.</p> <p>I believe brownfield sites should be considered in the first place, preferably out in the open countryside where businesses have previously traded.</p>	documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO1818</a>	Policy 8F - Habberley Road, Bewdley	Object	The proposal for 'travelling show people' WA/BE/6 is framed in a very misleading way. The plans state 'potential site for travelling showpeople'. The reality is that these are also designated sites for 'gypsies and travellers'. I don't think the true intention of these sites has been made as visible as it should have been, hence people have not had the fullest opportunity to make a considered view.	The 5 sites in the policy were for a specific family of travelling showpeople currently residing in the district. They were not identified as sites for Gypsy and Travellers as there is no immediate requirement to provide pitches.
	<a href="#">LPPO5158</a>	Policy 8F - Habberley Road site,	Comment	I am writing to express my concern at the possible new Travelling Show people site opposite The Mercure Hotel	Comments noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
		Bewdley		<p>in <b>Bewdley</b>.</p> <p>My main concern is the thought of lorries towing caravans and trailers turning onto what is an already busy road. It is an accident waiting to happen. While I am opposing this I wish to also show the same concern for the other suggested site at <b>Clows Top</b> for exactly the same reason. I was a resident of Clows Top for many years and I was heavily involved with the renovation and upkeep of the village hall. As with the Habberley Road site, it would be potentially dangerous to have such large vehicles entering and exiting on such busy roads.</p> <p>If these sites are opened, is it then opening the flood gates for more and more travelling families and their vehicles to use these sites? I understand they need to make a living and need somewhere to live but I also care about where I live and it really is a beautiful part of the country. It shouldn't be blighted by the sight of these large vehicles randomly coming and going, and possibly growing in community size over time.</p>	for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO894</a>	Policy8F Heath Lane	Support	Supports: <b>Land at Heath Lane, Shenstone</b> as a Travelling Showperson's Site within the Emerging Local Plan.	Support and comments noted.
Summerfield Against Land Transformation	<a href="#">LPPO1623</a>	Policy 8F - Heath Lane	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We reject the proposal for a Gypsy, Traveller and Showpeople site at Heath Lane based on its proximity to a school and the highly problematic road access. This site has been the subject of substantial local discussion and objection in the</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. This wasn't identified as a Gypsy and Travellers site.</p> <p>The proposed sites continue to be</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>past, and, without repeating at length previous objections, we once again reject this proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We reject the proposed gypsy, traveller and travelling show people site at Heath Lane as impractical and dangerous when judged against the Council's own site standards.</li> <li>Provision for this community needs to be the subject of wider discussion across Authority boundaries to avoid a disproportionate concentration of such sites near one another.</li> </ul>	<p>evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
Rock Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1163</a>	Policy 8F- Land at Clows Top	Object	<p>Rock Parish Council RESOLVED to oppose the use of land at Clows Top for Travelling Show People for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not an appropriate use of land in a visually high location within the district</li> <li>No Mains Sewerage System at Clows Top</li> <li>Lack of Transport links</li> <li>Road Safety and Accessibility at Clows Top</li> <li>Continuous Electricity Supply problems in the area</li> <li>Noise &amp; Nuisance</li> <li>Lack of school spaces at Far Forest Primary School</li> <li>Security issues in and around a potential site</li> <li>Nothing has changed since the previous rejection of Clows Top for travelling show people in September 2011</li> </ul>	<p>Objection noted. This site was previously considered for Gypsies and Travellers as opposed to Travelling Showpeople.</p> <p>The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1976</a>	Policy 8F Clows Top	Object	<p>I object most strongly to the potential site for travelling show people because:-</p> <p>- The travelling show equipment would be an eyesore</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>right in the heart of the village.</p> <p>- There is no drainage on the site.</p> <p>- The local primary schools are at full capacity and would find it difficult to deal with the seasonal influx of children during the winter period.</p> <p>- I do not object to building houses on the site, which would enhance and complete the village.</p>	included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO1972</a>	Policy 8F Land off Habberley Road	Object	<p>I object to the proposed travelling show people/gypsy site.</p> <p>Allowing this would be detrimental and poor publicity for Bewdley.</p> <p>After losing the coach parking from the town. Money would be better spent on re establishing the coach park.</p> <p>Previously refused for development.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3278</a>	Policy 8F - Land off Habberley Road, Bewdley	Object	<p>Having read the proposals for the Wyre Forest District Local Plan Review, I am objecting to the proposal for the development in Wribbenhall, Bewdley. (WA/BE/6).</p> <p><b>Highways Problems</b> - The A456 and B4129 in Wribbenhall are already very busy, and to build a travellers site in this area would cause even more congestion. Travelling show people use large vehicles, so</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>turning on and off the Habberley Road will cause many issues.</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>Tourism</b> - The area attracts many tourists, some of which use the Mercure Hotel. Building a travellers site opposite could potentially damage trade.</p> <p><b>Environmental Issues</b> - All of these plans raise many environmental issues.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO3279</a>	Policy 8F - Land off Habberley Road, Bewdley	Object	<p>As a resident of Bewdley, I would like to object to the WFDC local plan review WA/BE/6 regarding land being used for travelling show people, opposite the Mercure Heath Hotel.</p> <p>My reasons for the objection being:</p> <p>* This site could not be restricted to one user (circus or fairground travellers) and would encourage any travellers to the area, causing environmental damage and costing the taxpayer for the upkeep of the site.</p> <p>* This proposal could cause serious damage to the two</p>	The site would be owned and occupied by a specific Travelling Showpeople and therefore not open to other travellers.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>businesses close by.</p> <p>* The B4129 is a busy road and the large vehicles these visitors use would cause a highway issue.</p> <p>* Property value would decrease in Bewdley, especially the Wribbenhall side, due to this proposal.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO3281</a>	Policy 8F - Land off Habberley Road, Bewdley	Object	<p>We are writing with reference and strong objection to the proposed land allocated for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople as outlined in Section 19 of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>There are many reasons to oppose this proposal, as follows:-</p> <p>1.) The Proposal raises many environmental concerns within a protected Green Belt area. If the site becomes a traveller site then service utilities will need to be constructed.</p> <p>2.) If the proposed site was agreed for use by travelling showpeople its use could not be restricted to one user type and therefore bringing potential use for living facilities for other travelling groups.</p> <p>3.) The site is close to a number of thriving businesses that bring a lot of visitors and tourists to the area. By having a traveller site close to these businesses will potentially damage trade to not only these businesses</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>but also the Bewdley business community as a whole. Bewdley needs more hotels to attract tourists. It does not need a site that will deter tourists and potentially close down a good hotel.</p> <p>4.) The B4190 Habberley Road is a very busy road known for fatal accidents. Caravans, waste disposal trucks, construction traffic and other slow moving vehicles entering and exiting the site will increase the risk of potentially dangerous traffic, cycling and pedestrian issues.</p> <p>5.) Sites adjacent to the proposed site have been subject of previous planning applications and 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 Green Belt area between Kidderminster and Bewdley.</p> <p>6.) The travellers could dominate the local community within the Habberley Road area.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2600</a>	Policy 8F - sites for travelling show people (Bewdley)	Object	<p>The roads are becoming unable to cope with the traffic we have already.</p> <p>Bewdley, over the past few years, has had road closures beyond belief for gas, water and electricity.</p> <p>I am assuming we do not get added money for the infrastructure, waste, schools, policing, from central</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p> <p>The consultation was for a Travelling</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				government.	Showpeople site and the demand for the site is evidenced in the policy.
	<a href="#">LPPO3290</a>	Policy 8F - Wilden Top ADR, Stourport	Comment	<p><b><u>Proposed Travelling Showpeople Storage at Wilden Top (ADR)</u></b></p> <p>Storage of fairground rides etc is a commercial, industrial use which would be inappropriate for a semi rural residential area with narrow access roads and no footpaths. Surely a more suitable site can be identified on an industrial park or similar within the district? Stourport already has far more than its share of providing for travellers and we have been assured in the past that future provision would be better dispersed across the District.</p> <p>If this site is to be developed, housing would be more appropriate.</p>	Comment noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2161</a>	Policy 8F - Wilden Top site	Object	<p>I am writing in connection with the possible use of the site on the corner of Bigbury Lane and Wooden top road as a possible use for storage and residential facility for travelling showpeople. I would like to register my opposition to the allocation of this site for the following reasons:-</p> <p>This site is difficult to access for large vehicles and could only be made use of by extensive alteration to the surrounding roads, Bigbury Lane itself is almost inaccessible to large vehicles and Wooden top road</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				already suffers enough with the enforced use by Talbot transport vehicles, the edges of the road are constantly being damaged by this traffic.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3356</a>	The Heath	Object	<p>1. Land at the site adjacent to this was previously refused planning as it was found to have Bronze Age burial mound. Also planning inspectors have previously ruled that there should be no encroachment on the area between Bewdley and Kidderminster.</p> <p>2. The B1429 is already a busy rd and I have no idea how large plant type vehicles will negotiate the turning Catchems End, not to mention any which find their way into ,which would mean that they would negotiate an historic bridge, and add to the already poor air quality in the town.</p> <p>3. The hotel is the only major hotel for Bewdley and this opposite would prove detrimental to their trade.</p> <p>5. Finally it is my understanding that other families would have access to this site if the proposal goes ahead.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO1690</a>	WA/BE/5 Habberley Road	Object	<p>Ref: WA/BE/5 – consultation for change of use Habberley Road, Bewdley.</p> <p>We would like to express our strong objections to the change of use under consideration of the Green Belt area on Habberley Road for a site for travelling show</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>people.</p> <p>The B4129 is not suitable for the process of heavy vehicles. Already a busy road the turning of such large vehicles on and off the proposed site will cause safety issues for other road users. There will be no means of limiting use to sole occupancy and therefore the number of users on the site, equally no means of limiting the impact of increased traffic in the area.</p> <p>The site is opposite a key tourist business for the area. The location of such a site so close to the hotel runs the very real risk of damaging the hotel’s ability to attract visitors. Not only is the hotel a large employer and consumer of services in the area but the hotel guests also bring much needed revenue to local businesses.</p> <p>You should bear in mind that many local residents have invested heavily in the area and will reconsider if the surrounding area is significantly altered, again taking much needed revenue away from the area.</p> <p>There are many environmental impacts to be considered – additional pollution in the area, the loss of natural habitat for the wildlife and the potential damage to a bronze age burial mound.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2378</a>	WA/BE/6	Object	I object to Habberley Road site:	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>It goes against all previous planning advice.</p> <p>Constant movement of traffic on/off the site. The B4129 is busy rural road extra traffic would make it very dangerous.</p> <p>Hotel/golf club will suffer</p> <p>Damage to the local environment/wildlife.</p> <p>Residents would be affected by noise/ability to sell property</p> <p>There is no legal obligation to provide land for any further housing in Bewdley.</p>	for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3173</a>	WA/BE/6	Object	<p>Opposite a busy hotel that provides a lot of accommodation to local tourists along with a number of other activities that bring money into the local economy.</p> <p>Is opposite a leisure centre that is very well used from early in the morning to late at night.</p> <p>Is on a very busy road so the requirement for large turning areas for numerous vehicles etc... is going to cause problems.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO3174</a>	WA/BE/6	Object	<p>This site is opposite the biggest accommodation provider to tourists locally, on a road that already</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>sustains heavy traffic.</p> <p>The road is a fast one, with plenty of vehicles already turning into the Mercure either to stay at the hotel or to use the leisure facilities.</p> <p>The site is not that big that it could sustain much, so surely it would only be a matter of time before planning permission were applied for – previously turned down to other occupiers</p>	<p>for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p> <p>Officers have considered the Travelling Showpeople’s requirements in suggesting the 5 sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO467</a>	WA/BE/6	Object	<p>This against previous planning advice, there is potential damage to local businesses, highway issues this road is already very busy and would lead to more traffic, damage to local environment, effect on house prices for the area.</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2831</a>	WA/BE/6 Habberley Road, Bewdley	Object	<p>Considerable concerns at proposal to use the site for Travelling Show People:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site could not be restricted to one user and could be used for permanent living facilities.</li> <li>2. Sites adjacent have been refused planning permission due to the possibility of a bronze age burial mound and encroachment of the area separating Kidderminster and Bewdley.</li> <li>3. B4129 is a busy road used by local residents and also</li> </ol>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>as a bypass for Kidderminster. A Travelling Show People Site would mean large vehicles needing to manoeuvre to access the site causing a serious safety and delay issue on the highway.</p> <p>4. Site is close to the Mercure Hotel and the Golf Club which brings employment and revenue to the local area and could be threatened by this proposal.</p> <p>5. The proposal raises many potential environmental issues.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2096</a>	Wilden	Object	<p>I object to travellers site at Bigbury Lane, Wilden:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No knowledge of the plans</li> <li>2. Possible property devaluation</li> <li>3. Local travellers also oppose.</li> <li>4. Strong, close community spirit.</li> <li>5. Club/playing field adjacent to proposed site; users may go elsewhere</li> <li>6. Poor access</li> <li>7. Pay a higher tax band to live here.</li> <li>8. Fly-tipping problem would worsen and dog walking land lost</li> <li>9. Site in Stone has no nearby community</li> </ol>	Information on the Local Plan was posted to every household and advertised throughout the District.
	<a href="#">LPPO4761</a>	Wilden	Comment	Land adjacent to Ceramaspeed, accessed at Zortech Avenue, and Wilden (M1/21) which are closer to main roads/drainage/commercial property.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				An additional consideration is that for the travelling showpeople, easy access to main arterial roads to travel around the country would be advantageous.	for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO320</a>	Wilden ADR	Object	Objects.	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPPO2966</a>	Wilden Top	Object	<p>I would like to raise an objection to the 'Land within Wilden Top Area of Developmental Restraint, Wilden' site suggestion (Policy 8F p64). This area would be highly unsuitable for use by travelling showpeople for a number of reasons.</p> <p>Firstly, the surrounding roads/lanes are unsuitable for the large and heavy vehicles used by travelling showpeople. Access would be along either Wilden Top Road or Bigbury Lane. Both of these are narrow roads, often not wide enough for two average-sized cars to pass safely. Neither have pedestrian footpaths despite being used regularly by pedestrians, who would be put at greater risk by the additional, significantly larger traffic should this site be chosen.</p> <p>Secondly, the area suggested is a well used community area. Dozens of dog walkers and families use this land every day. We are in a beautiful area of countryside; most residents have chosen to live here due to the</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>access to such areas which you don't find elsewhere in Stourport. Ownership of the land was, supposedly, given to the local people as an amenity area and it would be a great shame to lose that.</p> <p>Thirdly, the location around Wilden Top is a quiet, semi-rural, residential area. Having a site for travelling showpeople which would be used for business purposes as well as residential would greatly increase the noise levels for the surrounding residents.</p> <p>Finally, the area proposed is home to a huge range of wildlife. These habitats would be destroyed by allowing the site to be developed and used by travelling showpeople. The area has previously been allotted as an 'Area of Developmental Restraint' and should be kept as such.</p> <p>The family of travelling showpeople currently own land on Heath Lane, Stone so in my opinion this would be the ideal place for them to reside.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO3007</a>	Wilden Top	Object	<p>I am writing to give my views on the proposed plans for a Travellers site in Stourport. I understand there is a plan to build a Traveller site on land at Wilden Top. This seems to me to be grossly unfair as there is already adequate provision for Travellers in Stourport and as far as I am aware, there is none in Kidderminster or Bewdley.</p>	<p>The policy was for a travelling showpeople site. This would be an alternative provision for a family that currently reside in the District and differs from Gypsy and Traveller provision.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3018</a>	Wilden Top	Object	<p>The proposal for development at Lickhill Road North does compromise open land and will, without doubt, add extra pressure to a very busy junction.</p> <p>Areley Kings, Burlish Crossing and Wilden Top proposals all encroach on either Green Belt or open land which we should look to retain wherever possible.</p> <p>The fact there is no provision for infrastructure is extremely worrying and somewhat surprising.</p> <p>If the funds are available for such upgrades in Kidderminster why are they not available for Stourport &amp; Bewdley?</p>	Comments noted. We cannot meet housing needs without using a small percentage of Green Belt land and will consider infrastructure requirements alongside the requirement to preserve the Green Belt where possible.
	<a href="#">LPPO3546</a>	Wilden Top	Object	<p><b>M1/21 Location at Wilden top for potential traveller site.</b></p> <p>Wilden top is a beautiful piece of countryside that has suffered negatively from cheap housing in the past where residents on lower incomes have struggled to make a positive impact on this area whilst the village itself is a desirable location. If Wilden top was to have any development at all it should be to create a positive community, bringing Wilden top residents into the village, we have a cricket field and farm land, the motor cross and the railway for walks. More could be done to build better detached housing and regenerate the Wilden top estate, a decent park for the village, recreational, tennis or football club, a playing field for</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>the school etc.</p> <p>Believes it would have a negative impact on the community, house prices, beautiful countryside, and nature, as well as putting pressure on Wilden school.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPP03647</a>	Wilden Top	Object	<p>Concerned about the proposals at Wilden Top Area of Development Restraint (ADR). We would like to object to and express concern about the proposals in the LPRPO document, June 2017, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include the site as a potential site for Travelling Showpeople</li> <li>• Continue to include the site as an ADR for the development of housing</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the substantial impact upon the rural and unspoilt nature of Bigbury Lane we have the following major concerns about the proposed development:-</p> <p><b><u>Concerns relating to the creation of a site for Travelling Showpeople</u></b></p> <p><b>A1. The physical layout of the site appears to be completely unsuitable for the development of a site for Travelling Showpeople.</b></p> <p>I believe the structure, composition and layout of the site make it completely unsuitable as a site for Travelling Showpeople and does not meet the criteria detailed in</p>	<p>Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.</p> <p>This site is already allocated as an ADR site. It was allocated as an ADR in a previous local plan that went through the examination process and became adopted.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>the Baker Report. The Baker Report sought to identify a shortlist of potential sites for Gypsies and Travellers and for Travelling Showpeople. As it did not include the site at Wilden Top as a site for Travelling Showpeople it seems reasonable to infer that it was not deemed suitable at the time. After studying both the report and the site we cannot understand why it is now being proposed as a site for Travelling Showpeople. When assessing the site as a potential site for Gypsies and Travellers the Baker Report stated that most of the site was unsuitable except for a small area which offered an opportunity for four gypsy and traveller plots. The Baker Report, Appendix 4, states clearly that <i>“the central and eastern part of the site is an unsuitable location for development”</i> and details why. It should be remembered that only a small section of this site was proposed as a site for four pitches for Gypsies and Travellers, not as a site for Travelling Showpeople. It should also be noted that, this site is adjacent to a three story residential local heritage asset, inhabited by a young family, and therefore we would argue an inhabited site would have both a substantial impact upon privacy of this property and upon the privacy of any residents living on this site. We would question whether access to the site is wide enough. This site and several others were later <i>“ruled out of the consultation at Cabinet because of concerns regarding their suitability and deliverability”</i>. I believe that this decision was correct and do not understand why the site has been proposed as a site for Travelling</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Showpeople after rejection by these reports.</p> <p>In addition, the authors of the Baker Report appear to be unaware that the site borders onto two black and white “Mock Tudor Buildings”, which are included in the Stourport Local Heritage List, which identifies these as heritage assets that are valued as distinctive elements of the local historic environment that are not protected by statutory designations.</p> <p>The Local Plan Review Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal Report states that all of the Stourport sites “score well in terms of access to services apart from the sites at Wilden Top and Sandy Lane which are not so well served by facilities.” The site scores negatively in relation to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve and enhance the provision and accessibility to local services and facilities</li> <li>• To protect soil and land</li> <li>• To protect and enhance landscape and townscape</li> <li>• To maintain the integrity of the Green Belt within the District</li> <li>• To maintain and enhance community and settlement identities</li> </ul> <p>I would like to suggest that this the scoring for the site in section 11 (<i>to protect and enhance the historic environment and it’s settings</i>) should be reclassified</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>from N/A as the proposed development is adjacent to two locally listed buildings which are of local heritage value and would majorly detract from, not enhance, their setting.</p> <p>The LPRPO states that there is “<i>a specific current need for one family site to be allocated to accommodate</i>” the current occupants of the site at Long Bank. The Baker Report (page 21) states that the existing family of Travelling Showpeople have requirements, which include the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>to store the lorries, fairground equipment and to provide residential accommodation (caravans) for the 3 sons</i></li> <li>• <i>ideally the site should be in the same general location (Long Bank, Bewdley)</i></li> <li>• <i>should be at least 2 acres in size</i></li> <li>• <i>needs good access to the road network</i></li> </ul> <p>When considering how the site would meet the requirements of the proposed tenants the Baker Report, 2011 lists some of the broad locational criteria for Travelling Showpeople sites (taken from the Showmen’s Guild of Great Britain Model Standard Package) which include:- The site should:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>be relatively flat</i></li> <li>• <i>have good vehicular access</i></li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Other requirements identified by representatives of Town and Parish Councils include that the site should:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>fit in with existing communities</i></li> <li>• <i>not result in the removal of hedges and should not have a landscape impact.</i></li> </ul> <p>The report also refers to Policy CP06 and includes the following specific criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Neighbouring uses should be complementary to the amenities of the proposed site</i></li> <li>• <i>The development of the site should not negatively impact on biodiversity or green infrastructure and should be capable of integration with the landscape character of the area.</i></li> <li>• <i>There is safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access and that the site can be easily accessed by towing caravans</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Page 24 includes the following criteria – “The site will have a good residential environment and will not adversely impact upon neighbouring residential amenity”</i></p> <p>I believe that a brief walk of the site will demonstrate that the site fails to meet most of the criteria above, the site:</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is not flat - it includes “<i>steep slopes</i>”. The top section (currently used by dog walkers) is composed of some very uneven ground with substantial height variations. The lower field is at a substantially different level to the upper field and we cannot understand how vehicles could access, be accommodated by, or travel around the site.</li> <li>• does not have good vehicular access</li> <li>• is not near to the exiting location (Long Bank)</li> <li>• does not fit in with the existing community and would be sited next to two locally listed Mock Tudor Buildings and to houses accommodating families and children.</li> <li>• it is expected that it would result in the removal of hedges and would have a landscape impact.</li> <li>• neighbouring uses (family accommodation in locally listed buildings of historic value) are not complementary to the amenity of the proposed site.</li> <li>• the site would substantially negatively impact upon the biodiversity or green infrastructure and is not capable of integration with the landscape character of the area (see C2).</li> </ul> <p>It has been noted that the size of the Wilden Top site (2.7 ha) is substantially larger than the other proposed sites. Assuming that the other sites are large enough to accommodate the family does this mean that the Wilden Top site would also allow additional pitches? Or are all</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>of the other sites too small? A representative of the Council advised me that the site would only accommodate equipment during the winter months, not families. However, the Baker Report states that residential accommodation (caravans) is required for the 3 sons. It is assumed that these requirements also change over a period of time. It would be helpful if additional information could be provided about how the proposed site would impact upon the lives of local residents and how it would look from the roads/footpaths that border the site.</p> <p><b>A2. Lack of any suitable access to and from the site for large wide vehicles using the existing lanes.</b></p> <p>The absence of a footpath, which could offer protection to pedestrians from wide vehicles travelling along large sections of these roads further increases the risks to pedestrian safety.</p> <p>The site does not have good vehicular access or good access to the existing road network. It is accessed by narrow lanes, with large sections without footpaths to protect any pedestrians from the path of large vehicles. The road sign at the base of Bigbury Lane states “No HGV” and I cannot envisage how vehicles as high as the “Dingle View”/ Fun House would pass below the line of overhanging trees bordering large sections of the lane. As highlighted in the Baker Report, there is a gateway at the lower end of the site (within Bigbury Lane), but given</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>the width of the lane at that point, it is difficult to envisage how a large vehicle such as “Dingle View”, or any other wide vehicle, could turn into the site as we anticipate that the turning circle would be insufficient.</p> <p><b>A3: The impact of noise on neighbouring properties produced by maintenance and repair work to equipment, reversing, loading and unloading metal equipment, and vehicle movement, which I understand may be undertaken on a site for Travelling Showpeople.</b></p> <p><i>According to the Local Plan sites for Travelling Showpeople “need to be designed in an appropriate manner which minimises any impacts on neighbouring uses and occupiers”</i></p> <p>As evidenced above we believe this site would have an enormous impact upon neighbouring residential properties, their occupiers and on nature conservation. It is anticipated that movement of equipment to and from bookings could create substantial noise to the detriment of the residents of local housing due to loading and unloading of metal equipment with the potential to wake young children sleeping in the neighbouring properties. A representative of the Council recently advised that this would only happen at the beginning and end of the season but having observed the Fun/Crooked House vehicle initially in a field at the site at Long Bank and then at the Far Forest Countryside</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>Show this seems unlikely. In the past, the fair has been involved in the Three Kings Parade (an early evening event) which I anticipate would necessitate a return of the equipment to base late at night. It seems highly likely that the equipment would be moved between many bookings which must be scattered throughout the country during the year. It is anticipated that this movement of equipment could often involve loading and unloading, possibly during the early hours of the morning or very late at night. This could cause substantial noise disruption to neighbours. Would a site for travelling show people have restriction detailing when vehicles can be moved, loaded or unloaded?</p> <p><b><u>C: Concerns Relating to Both Proposals</u></b></p> <p>As far as I am aware , unlike the other sites included in the LPRPO it does not include an indicative number of dwellings for the ADR at Wilden Top or for the number of pitches proposed for a site for Travelling Showpeople, which makes it difficult to comment on the scale of the impact of the proposals. The number of dwellings or pitches proposed would obviously affect the scale of the impact of any development on the local area. Is it possible to provide this information? The Baker Report, Appendix 4, 2011, states that availability of the site “is currently unknown” - I assume that this is still the case as there appear to be no references in the document to the owners wishing to sell/ make available the land.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>The Planning Team should walk around the site before proceeding any further with this proposal as, in light of the points above, we cannot understand why this site is being considered as a potential site for Travelling Showpeople or retained as an ADR.</p> <p><b>C1. Any additional pedestrian footfall must substantially increase the risks to pedestrian safety on Bigbury Lane due to the narrowness of some sections of the lane and absence of a footpath along the majority of the lane. These risks would also be substantially increased by wide vehicles attempting to pass pedestrians on narrow sections of the lane where there is no footpath.</b></p> <p>Bigbury Lane is a narrow lane and is not suitable for any additional pedestrian traffic. One section is particularly narrow and bendy and is located on a hill, which can encourage traffic travelling downhill to gather speed. The creation of either a housing site (or a site for Travelling Showpeople) could potentially result in increased pedestrian footfall to the base of Bigbury Lane and could lead to major pedestrian/road traffic incidents. Although I imagine that any plans to create housing in the ADR at the top of Wilden Lane could include the creation of a footpath alongside such housing I cannot envisage how the lower section of Bigbury Lane could be made safe for pedestrians.</p> <p>Problems occur when motorists try to travel either up or</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>down the Lane and encounter a vehicle travelling in the opposite direction. Cars often have to wait and sometimes pull onto the drive of private properties, in order to pass oncoming traffic. This can be further complicated by pedestrians trying to negotiate a safe route along the Lane, which must present a significant risk to pedestrian safety. Any increase to the footfall along this section of the Lane would, in my view, substantially increase this risk.</p> <p>At present I think most of the pedestrians from the housing estate at the top of the hill travel down Bigbury Lane.</p> <p>It has been suggested by a Local Councillor that some of the residents of the housing estate at the top of the hill, use Wilden Top Lane to access Hartlebury Road or use the public footpath that leads to the community centre to access Wilden Lane. I have visited this footpath and would like to invite other representatives of WFDC to do the same. The path includes several sections which have a very steep gradient, one section has many steps which would be not be accessible for anyone using a buggy or pushchair or for many older people. Therefore I believe that existing and additional pedestrians are most likely to use Bigbury Lane to access Wilden Lane. Some residents will not feel safe using an off road public footpath especially in the dark whereas Bigbury Lane has street lights. The top section of Hillary Road and majority of Wilden Top Lane do not have streetlights</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>which, I expect, would encourage further pedestrian footfall along Bigbury Lane from any new development at Wilden Top when it is the dark.</p> <p>I think many people will understandably have to weigh up the risks between walking down an isolated footpath (with a steep gradient but with no traffic) to walking down a busy narrow lane with no footpath.</p> <p>Bigbury Lane is also frequently used by horse riders, which can add to the risk from traffic and pedestrians trying to pass in narrow sections of the lane.</p> <p>Any significant housing development in the Wilden Top ADR, even if it included the provision of a footpath in that section of the Lane, would substantially further reduce road safety along the lower section of Bigbury Lane where there is no footpath. This is particularly important given the high volume of young families that walk down the lane to access Wilden Primary School, older children who access the bus route to Stourport High School, and workers who walk to bus routes and the main road via Wilden Lane.</p> <p><b>C2. Destruction of the natural environment and the impact upon local wildlife, particularly some protected species including the local bat population.</b></p> <p>It is expected that the development of any new housing would completely destroy the habitat of resident wildlife</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>and a site for Travelling Showpeople, to a slightly lesser extent, could destroy the habitat of and displace local wildlife.</p> <p>This piece of land has been allowed to grow wild for a significant period. Any development, either a site for Travelling Showpeople or a housing development could destroy local wildlife, which may include protected species.</p> <p>The land located at Wilden Top was taken out of the Green Belt in 1989 and designated as an Area of Developmental Restraint and this designation has not been adjusted since then. However as this action was taken 18 years ago I believe that there is significant reason to review this decision.</p> <p>During the last 18 years the land in question and the surrounding land, at the top and middle of Bigbury Lane, must have matured further and I believe that the site is now home to a broad spectrum of wildlife. I believe that before any plan for housing or for the creation of a site for Travelling Showpeople is approved an independent bat survey and a full wildlife survey should be undertaken in order to assess the potential impact of any development upon the environment, particularly any protected species of wildlife nesting and living within this site.</p> <p>Bats have been observed frequently in the gardens of</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>the houses immediately below the proposed site at Wilden Top. Without a thorough independent survey there is a major risk that substantially changing the nature of the Wilden Top site either as a housing development or a site for Travelling Showpeople could risk breaking the law if it causes “<i>damage or destroy a breeding or resting place</i>” or “<i>obstruct access to their resting or sheltering places</i>” .</p> <p><b>C3. Exacerbation of existing congestion issues in Bigbury Lane.</b></p> <p>Difficulties are frequently experienced in passing oncoming traffic and in parking, particularly in the middle and lower sections of Bigbury Lane. This would be made much worse by the increased volume of traffic that would accompany a new housing development but would also be exacerbated by any additional traffic, particularly wide vehicles.</p> <p>Bigbury Lane already suffers from major congestion and a lack of adequate parking spaces. There is not sufficient room for visitors to residential properties to park.</p> <p>Passing vehicles frequently have to pull over to allow traffic to pass, either in the stopping places or sometimes onto the edge of private driveways in order to pass oncoming vehicles, often causing tailbacks.</p> <p>Increased congestion and parking issues also increases</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>the risks to pedestrian safety as pedestrians have to navigate between and around vehicles without a suitable footpath.</p> <p>Any additional proposed housing development must increase the number of vehicles and pedestrians using the lane, exacerbate parking issues and thereby further increase the risks to pedestrian safety. Would it be responsible to propose a development at Wilden Top that would create these problems, particularly as it could pose a threat to public safety by encouraging and increasing pedestrian footfall in this steep narrow lane, mostly without a footpath, used by many families and other pedestrians to access the local school and Wilden Lane.?</p> <p><b><u>Conclusion</u></b></p> <p>In the light of the information above we would like to object to the proposals for the site at Widen Top to either create a site for Travelling Showpeople or to continue to allocate the site as an Area of Development Restraint. Due to the number and gravity of our concerns my neighbour and I would appreciate the opportunity to meet representatives of Wyre Forest District Council at or adjacent to the site to discuss our concerns and how, or if, they can be addressed before any of these proposals are included in the next version of the Proposed Local Plan.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP04018</a>	Wilden Top	Object	<p>I do not believe the land at Wilden Top is suitable for travelling show people.</p> <p>The road infrastructure is too narrow to cope with extra vehicles and the lack of footpath makes it dangerous to pedestrians. Bigbury Lane is sometimes blocked by delivery vehicles. The alternative route to the school is via steps so unsuitable for those with pushchairs.</p> <p>Accessing the site from Wilden Top Road would be dangerous to pedestrians as there is no footpath. The sides of the road are already worn away by vehicles.</p> <p>Property prices would be affected as would wildlife and the community. Wilden is a rural area used by cyclists and ramblers etc.</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
	<a href="#">LPP04667</a>	Wilden Top	Support	Supports.	Support noted.
Stourport on Severn Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP01303</a>	Wilden Top ADR	Comment	<p>We feel this is a commercial, industrial use which would be inappropriate for a residential area with narrow access roads and no footpaths. A large number of children walk past this site travelling to and from school. This increases the risk of road accidents.</p> <p>Stourport already has the “lion’s share” of providing facilities for travellers and we have been assured in the past (2011, 2012, 2014) that future provision would be</p>	Objection noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				dispersed across the District.  If this site is to be developed, housing would be more appropriate.	
	<a href="#">LPP04760</a>	Zortech Avenue	Comment	Land adjacent to Ceramaspeed, accessed at Zortech Avenue, and Wilden (M1/21) which are closer to main roads/drainage/commercial property. An additional consideration is that for the travelling showpeople, easy access to main arterial roads to travel around the country would be advantageous.	Comment noted. The proposed sites continue to be evaluated to identify the most suitable site and the final proposal for the Travelling Showpeople site will be included in the pre-submission documents.
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	<a href="#">LPP0556</a>	8.1	Comment	Unconvinced these figures are realistic and can be proven to be an up-to-date OAHN.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPP03629</a>	8.1	Object	The 2017 objective assessment of housing needs report states that we need 300 new dwellings P.A totalling 5,400 new dwellings. However this is contradictory to our population increase figures as they have predominately remained static. I believe that every area within the Wyre forest should have a representative group working alongside the council to compromise on the amount of development they are comfortable with, taking into account local needs. It is vital that villages are kept as villages and not merged onto existing town boundaries.	The OAHN has considered a range of housing numbers based on different economic forecasts and is the standard methodology available at the time. The OAHN will be revised in light of the standardised methodology proposed in the NPPF.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPP01397</a>	Housing Need	Comment	1. The guidelines set out in the National Planning Policy Framework states that we should consider only future scenarios that could reasonably be	The OAHN has considered a range of housing numbers based on different economic forecasts and is the standard

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>expected to occur. The population of the Wyre Forest has only grown slightly since 1991 and remains fairly static. After a decade with a population increase of only 1.1% between 2001 and 2011, the population then only increased by a further 1.1% from 2013 to 2015. This equates to a 2.7% increase in population growth from 2001 to 2015 (point 2.3 of the Objective Assessment of Housing Needs ‘OAHN’ Report May 2017).</p> <p>2. The National Statistics Sub National Population Projections (SNPP) 2014 evidences a growth of population for the outlook period at 4.7% with a requirement of only 199 dwellings per annum. This is significantly less than the projection in the WFDC Local Plan Review which states the need of 300 dwellings per annum (this must be based on a 7.7% increase). This would give us a <b>285% higher rate of growth than in the last 10 year period which is completely improbable.</b></p> <p>3. If we used the SNPP recommendations for building 199 dwellings per annum over the stated 15 year period, we only need to build 2,985 dwellings in total - which negates the need to take Green Belt land around the District and reduces the WFDC consultation figures by 2,415 houses.</p> <p>4. The consultation document (section 6A) assumes 300 dwellings per annum should be required, but even the PG Short Term Data</p>	<p>methodology available at the time. The OAHN will be revised in light of the standardised methodology proposed in the NPPF.</p> <p>Please see the comments given above to explain the range in numbers that will support the Council’s aspirations for economic growth.</p> <p>We will follow the government’s standardised methodology for housing need when published in 2018.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>shows an increase of 5.8% which is twice the growth of the last 15 year period and still only has a need for 229 dwellings per annum. This is 1,278 dwellings <b>less</b> than currently assumed.</p> <p>5. No allowance has been made for the age profile of the Wyre Forest population leading to increased mortality rates and hence increased availability of property in the district. It is likely that many properties will come free over the next 15 years as people downsize, move to Care homes, live with children outside the area or die.</p> <p>6. We firmly believe that growth figures will be less than 5.8% based on national projections and taking account of the recent cutbacks in the carpet industry in Kidderminster. Along with the forthcoming government attempts to reduce immigration, this will bring the figure close to the 2.7% experienced over the last 15 years.</p> <p>7. The Amion Report (which was used for the calculations projected in the Local Plan) assumes a much higher rate of population growth than the actual growth within the Wyre Forest over the past 15 years and we believe it is therefore flawed.</p> <p>8. The OAHN Report says that the number of vacant properties in the Wyre Forest is 3.2% and that there are currently 44,490 dwellings in the area. The Report increases the allowance for vacant properties to 4.5%. Increasing the</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>vacancy rate by 1.3% means that the housing demand has been unnecessarily increased by 578 dwellings (or 39 per annum).</p> <p>9. <b>Consequently, the need for new dwellings in Wyre Forest up to 2034 will realistically be under 3,000 and therefore the need to use any Green Belt land is unnecessary.</b></p> <p>10. We would also like to remind the WFDC that they do not have to accept the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) targets for housing, especially if they have large amounts of Green Belt or other protected land. Indeed, Brighton and Hove, Watford, Hastings and Crawley have recently set housing targets of only half their assessed need.</p>	
Summerfield Against Land Transformation	<a href="#">LPPO1618</a>	OAHN	Comment	<p>We believe that OAHN to be a deeply flawed piece of work and that the projected level of growth in housing need to be an unsafe basis for the Plan.</p> <p>The OAHN focuses upon local demographic, economic and housing market analyses. We have real concerns about this body of work and the weight given to it in the draft Plan. Firstly, we take exception to the methodology which is largely desk based research. The net result is a blizzard of numbers covering a wide array of projections, especially population projections, which are so wide and couched in so many caveats as to be meaningless. It is difficult to understand why the plan inflates population</p>	The OAHN has considered a range of housing numbers based on different economic forecasts and is the standard methodology available at the time. The OAHN will be revised in light of the standardised methodology proposed in the NPPF.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>growth when the data are open to widely differing interpretations and do not support the assertions in the draft Plan.</p> <p>The other methodological flaw is the “on-line survey of key stakeholders” and interviews with estate and lettings agents. In terms of the on-line survey the survey population is not numerically defined so a response rate cannot be determined and thus the value of the exercise and the representativeness of the yield. Whilst qualitative information is of value in support of a quantitative survey, the quality of the work on both fronts is so flawed as to render the findings meaningless.</p> <p>We reject the argument and the evidence upon which it is based as deeply flawed and believe the projected level of growth in housing need to be an unsafe basis for the Plan. In addition, given the high property vacancy rate (3.2%) in Wyre Forest it is difficult to understand the enthusiasm for such a scale of house building.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPP03815</a>	8.1	Object	<p>I strongly object to the Council’s development strategy; the OAHN shows different Affordable housing need to the figure used by the Council which is based on its own contractor analysis dismissing 3 nationally acclaimed analysis.</p> <p>The so called evidence is flawed and biased towards large scale development regardless of its suitability combined with a flawed drive to obtain an eastern</p>	<p>The OAHN has considered a range of housing numbers based on different economic forecasts and is the standard methodology available at the time. The OAHN will be revised in light of the standardised methodology proposed in the NPPF.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				bypass that will starve Kidderminster of valuable custom. The statement contradicts paragraph 8.2 which says that the housing market is stable and stakeholders believe there is no market for extra homes.	
	<a href="#">LPP0490</a>	8.2	Support	We are currently a stable authority the large scale development suggested in this review will destabilize the District for the future.	Comments and support noted.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01430</a>	8.2	Object	<p>Wyre Forest is a “largely self contained Housing Market Area”, this ignores the fact that 38% of residents in employment work outside of the area mainly in The Black Country and Birmingham. Housing overspill from these areas needs to be accommodated in the adjoining shire authorities, homes in Wyre Forest areas will be occupied by people currently residing in the Black Country and Birmingham or who will migrate into the region and will live in Wyre Forest whilst commuting to the higher order economic centres.</p> <p>The Black Country Authority and Birmingham authorities are essentially reliant on the reuse of providing developed land to meet the numbers identified within their administrative areas but many of these sites have environmental and technical problems which are likely to delay their release assuming that these difficulties can be overcome at all.</p> <p>Objects to the plan’s failure to properly account for the housing overspill implications of the adjoining conurbations.</p>	The council will continue with its duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities but the recently published GL Hearn study indicates that the Black Country can meet its own housing need.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3631</a>	8.3	Object	While homeownership should be encouraged where possible, we have to take into account our economical climate and believe it to be nearly impossible for local residents to afford homes, especially the executive types. We fall into the danger zone of attracting second home buying, this defeating the object of catering for local needs. I do believe that further research needs to be carried out and believe this can be best achieved by having a designated representative work alongside local resident groups or neighbourhood plan groups, to identify more closely what each district requires.	Comments noted. The Council will support the provision of a range of housing to meet identified needs.
	<a href="#">LPPO3816</a>	Paragraph	Object	I object to the Council's development strategy and to Policy 8A which promotes a density of 35 houses/hectare. This needlessly consumes land and spreads development out rather than concentrating housing in the town centre where it is most needed.  Building out horizontally is flawed where land availability is limited and may cause problems for future generations; instead well designed higher blocks work well in urban areas avoiding the need to spread out.	The Council will follow NPPF requirements with regards to density.
	<a href="#">LPPO3634</a>	8.4	Object	The local plan needs to plan positively for a mix of housing based on assessment of the population growth of the people living in that district.	The housing need for the Local Plan is based on population data which includes births and death rates. It is also based on household projections. This information is shown in the Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) study.
Worcestershire	<a href="#">LPPO1142</a>	8.5/8.7/8.8	Comment	We welcome the recognition of the need to provide	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
County Council, Planning Economy & Performance				homes to meet the needs of the elderly and those with disabilities.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3683</a>	8.8	Object	<p>8.8 The list of homes does not correlate with the strategic review. There are many executive homes however the employment in Kidderminster is not available.</p> <p>35 Dwellings per hectare is too densely populated.</p> <p>How does the build homes for rent add to the growth developments for Kidderminster?</p>	The Council will follow NPPF requirements with regards to density.
	<a href="#">LPPO2162</a>	Housing Stock	Comment	<p>A detailed response received regarding the proposed development to the east of Kidderminster. A part summary of this response is listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is constructive to engage with Wyre Forest District Council about how the Green Belt land is developed in a more sensitive and thought through manner.</li> <li>• Wyre Forest has an ageing population. I believe there is sufficient housing within Wyre Forest for young families but these homes are currently occupied by older generation. Hence, the actual housing need is probably for residents 45-64 &amp; 65+. Providing homes for these groups will free</li> </ul>	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>up existing family housing stock. This 'existing stock' is already in the correct location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development to the east will be very popular to the overspill of commuters who travel to Birmingham but are priced out of Hagley. By building on the Green Belt, Wyre Forest residents may lose out on beautiful countryside, yet may not end up benefiting from the development? Can purchase of these new properties be restricted to residents associated with the area? For example:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Residents that currently live in Wyre Forest and have done so for 5 years.</li> <li>○ Residents that previously lived in Wyre Forest for 5 years.</li> <li>○ Residents who are related to a family member that has lived in Wyre Forest for 5 years.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• It is important to ensure, whatever developments go ahead in the areas of Green Belt within Wyre Forest, that these developments benefit Wyre Forest.</li> <li>• Older residents should be encouraged to move out of their larger homes by new homes being designed to meet their needs:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ two parking spaces and a guest space</li> <li>○ <b>some</b> garden</li> <li>○ at least two spacious bedrooms</li> <li>○ a bathroom each</li> <li>○ a study/office area (could be a bedroom,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>hence 3 bed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ a garage or outhouse building for garden items</li> <li>○ separate utility</li> <li>● As Green Belt areas are being considered for development, perhaps modern barn complexes that look aesthetically pleasing across countryside views should be considered? These would be relatively expensive for a two / three bedroom however, relative to the equity saved up in a family home, the hope is they would be affordable to the target market. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ These modern barn complexes could be spread out in more of a lane fashion retaining adjacent fields to be used for cycling, dog walking and the general enjoyment of the whole community.</li> <li>○ In terms of traffic, the lanes should access more than one major road, for instance the A448, the Birmingham Road and Deansford Lane (leading to the Worcester Road); if located in ‘Stone Hill North’ core site for example. The majority of target residents would not add to the existing morning commute traffic issues in the area as they are already retired.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPP03817</a>	8.8	Object	I object to the Council’s development strategy; it is a	Please see the Infrastructure Delivery

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				mistake to attract people to the area without assessment of the skills needed compared to those existing. The policy is flawed and unsustainable and will harm the area creating more strain on infrastructure/health services for little reward.	Plan.
	<a href="#">LPP0300</a>	8.9	Comment	The need for affordable housing and/or starter homes in Bewdley particularly needs to be addressed.	Comments noted.
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	<a href="#">LPP0557</a>	8.9	Comment	<p>Figures demonstrate at POLICY 8B of 100 minimum average target a continual shortfall of 50% per annum of affordable homes. This is an ongoing compounding unacceptable problem not being properly addressed. Certainly not by implementing OPTION A</p> <p>There needs to be a new mode of thought as to how to deal with this shortfall. The proposals suggested herewith in this overall representation would go a long way in dealing with this.</p>	The requirement for affordable housing must be balanced with what the market will deliver. Based on previous rates of delivery and in consultation with Registered Providers we believe 100 units is a realistic figure.
	<a href="#">LPP03818</a>	8.9	Object	I object to the Council's development strategy/Local Plan proposals. Policy 8B contradicts policy 6A in the amount of affordable housing proposed. Facts should be right before going to consultation hence this should be reassessed by external inspectors.	Comments noted.
Rentplus	<a href="#">LPP01110</a>	Affordable Housing Definition	Comment	The definition should be removed from the Reasoned Justification as replication is unnecessary and may, in light of the White Paper proposals, be quickly superseded.	Agreed.
	<a href="#">LPP02119</a>	Affordable	Comment	I understand that any houses built on Green Belt will be	It is not clear where this information has

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
		Housing		a minimum price of £200,000? That is not affordable. Young people in full time employment can not afford to get on the property ladder. Affordable housing needs to be large enough for families from the Wyre Forest to live in. There are approx. 2,400 on the council housing waiting list and the plan is to build 90 affordable each year? That doesn't seem nearly enough affordable homes. Is it because the council will get more investment for the more expensive houses?	been obtained from. For Shared Ownership (affordable housing for sale) it is usual to purchase a 50% share and therefore valued at around 50% of the open market price but percentage purchased can be lower. For more information visit the Help To Buy website.
	<a href="#">LPPO3834</a>	8.11	Object	I object to the Council's development strategy; there is confusion over the amount of affordable housing proposed by the Council compared to the analysis/statements in the review document. This confuses the public as to the Council's intentions. The process is flawed and should be repeated after the documents have been redrafted. I object to these sections pending clearer information.	The OAHN expresses a range depending on economic forecasts. It follows the government guidance on OAHNs available at the time and will be updated in line with changing guidance in the NPPF / PPG.
	<a href="#">LPPO3835</a>	8.12	Object	I object to the Council's strategy and thinking. There is confusion to the public over the numbers of affordable housing proposed by the Council compared to the analysis and various statements throughout the review document. They should be repeated after the documents have been redrafted. I object to these sections pending clearer information.	The OAHN expresses a range depending on economic forecasts. It follows the government guidance on OAHNs available at the time and will be updated in line with changing guidance in the NPPF / PPG.
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO558</a>	8.13	Comment	Modify plan where landowners adjacent to or close by existing smaller settlements allow a minimum of 50% affordable homes or starter homes will start to address this problem without affecting viability issues.	Comments noted. The percentage of affordable housing is based on viability studies and government policy.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01359</a>	8.13	Comment	In the third line, "housing rented" should be "rented housing".	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPP03836</a>	8.13	Object	I object to the Council's strategy and thinking. There is confusion to the public over the numbers of affordable housing proposed by the Council compared to the analysis and various statements throughout the review document. They should be repeated after the documents have been redrafted. I object to these sections pending clearer information.	Comments noted. The percentage of affordable housing is based on viability studies and government policy.  The full technical papers are on the Councils website.
	<a href="#">LPP03837</a>	8.14	Object	I object to the Council's strategy and thinking. There is confusion to the public over the numbers of affordable housing proposed by the Council compared to the analysis and various statements throughout the review document. They should be repeated after the documents have been redrafted. I object to these sections pending clearer information.	Comments noted. The percentage of affordable housing is based on viability studies and government policy.
	<a href="#">LPP03838</a>	8.15	Object	I object to the Council's strategy and thinking. There is confusion to the public over the numbers of affordable housing proposed by the Council compared to the analysis and various statements throughout the review document. They should be repeated after the	Comments noted. The percentage of affordable housing is based on viability studies and government policy.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				documents have been redrafted. I object to these sections pending clearer information.	
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPO1671</a>	8.16	Comment	<p>We note that in section 8.16 the District Council has highlighted the issues relating to the affordability of homes in the District’s rural areas.</p> <p>We encourage the Council to consider affordable housing provision on a range of sites within, and adjacent to, settlement boundaries including development on green field and Green Belt land. This approach is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	Comments noted.
Land Research & Planning Associates Ltd	<a href="#">LPO559</a>	8.2	Comment	The proposed percentage is far too restrictive where landowners should be encouraged. It should not expect willing landowners to have to provide supporting evidence.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPO3637</a>	8.22	Object	Self build and custom housing I am in favour of. I would request that you arrange a point of contact for all on the list to be able to meet and give suggestions for allocated spots to consider. As I notice there are 45.	Please contact the Council’s Community Led Housing co-ordinator.
	<a href="#">LPO3839</a>	8.23	Support	I support the paragraphs and statements therein for 8.23 to 8.25.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPO4725</a>	8.24	Comment	I know that you have considered self build under 8.24 but can I again make a plea that a proportion of any development site is offered to local builders as opposed to the large multi national builder (Taylor Wimpey et al). This would give more local employment and would also	We will include a revised policy on self/custom build in the pre-submission document.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				ensure that we don't end up with the same old housing designs across the development. We would go back to streets looking different from each other rather than the same.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3840</a>	8.24	Support	I support the paragraphs and statements therein for 8.23 to 8.25.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3841</a>	8.25	Support	I support the paragraphs and statements therein for 8.23 to 8.25.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3638</a>	8.25	Object	Self build and custom housing I am in favour of. I would request that you arrange a point of contact for all on the list to be able to meet and give suggestions for allocated spots to consider. As I notice there are 45.	Please contact the Council's Community Led Housing co-ordinator
	<a href="#">LPPO307</a>	8.29	Comment	Para 8.29 should also mention dependant relatives.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3842</a>	8.36	Object	I support the paragraphs and statements therein for 8.36.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3635</a>	8.0.2	Object	Table 8.0.2. The housing needs should make the top 3 highest % rates priority developments this being elderly accommodation, affordable homes to rent and affordable homes to buy, before any other strategy for development plans.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO2930</a>	Table 8.0.4	Object	Rural area housing mix would not be helped enough through the policies of the LPR  The LPR recognizes (table 8.0.4) the inability of local	Comments noted. The Council supports development in rural areas where it is in sustainable locations and meets identified local housing needs.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>people to afford to purchase an averagely priced house in several parishes- all over 80%. For the statistically significant parishes, such as Rock, the Core Sites at Far Forest and Bliss Gate will make little difference to this circumstance over the plan period or in the immediate future. Given the significant lack of affordability and the 'presumption in favour of development' as identified as part of NPPG, more consideration should be given to small sites in rural areas that are brownfield and or windfall that may not be within designated settlement boundaries but are not 'isolated', in order to support particular elements of the housing market.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO2974</a>	Table 8.0.4	Object	<p><b>Rural area housing mix would not be helped enough through the policies of the LPR</b></p> <p>The LPR recognizes (table 8.0.4) the inability of local people to afford to purchase an averagely priced house in several parishes- all over 80%. For the most significant parishes, such as <b>Rock</b>, the Core Sites at Far Forest and Bliss Gate will make little difference to this circumstance over the plan period or in the immediate future. Opportunities for small sites that are in a rural area, brownfield and or windfall, might emerge in the plan period. Given the significant lack of affordability in rural localities and the 'presumption in favour of development' as identified as part of NPPG, more consideration should be evident in the plan to support particular elements of the housing market beyond 'affordable' housing.</p> <p><b>Rural areas can contribute more to housing mix</b></p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council supports development in rural areas where it is in sustainable locations and meets identified local housing needs.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p><b>without detriment to landscape and sustainability.</b> Government guidance (NPPF- Rural housing 19 May 2016) considers rural housing essential to the sustainability and viability of local facilities. Whilst the LPR provides for new housing, the LPR recognizes that Bewdley for example, as a local market town, will provide local services-schools, doctors, dentists, and service business such as hairdressers and used by the surrounding local community. The existing rural community travels to Bewdley and supports a vibrant town. This may be associated with tourism but it also a significant reflection on the income levels of the surrounding rural area. The 40 houses on 2 sites at For Forest (at relatively high densities of nearly 30 houses to the hectare, compared to surroundings), represent a concentration of new development, with the only additional contribution at Bliss Gate, of 5 houses, (at a lower density of 16 houses to the hectare). These 2 sites are only small scale contribution to a very critical rural housing need. Sustainability, as NPPF indicates, includes widening the choice of high quality homes. Responding to different opportunities in different areas must be provided for by taking local circumstances into account, particularly in relation to the provision of housing in the more expensive but rural parishes in the west of the plan area, such as Rock, by policy, beyond that of 8C which seems concerned only with affordable housing.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO406</a>	8	Comment	See summary LPPO400.	The OAHN is commissioned by the Council to identify Housing Needs. We will work

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
					with Neighbouring Authorities through the duty to cooperate and follow NPPF guidance with regards to Green Belt.
	<a href="#">LPPO429</a>	8	Comment	<p>I object to Option A and Option B.</p> <p>Green Belt land should be used only as a VERY LAST RESORT.</p> <p>Wyre Forest, Greater Birmingham, Solihull and Worcestershire should collaborate and collectively review overall brown field site availability and plan housing development accordingly – decisions to build on the Green Belt should not be based on local authority boundaries.</p> <p>The 5 year rolling time frame for construction sites should allow for regular reviews of brown field sites and enable changes to be incorporated into any plan,.</p> <p>The plan fails to recognise changes in shopping habits and unrealistically targets retail expansion and comparison shopping.</p> <p>Kidderminster has suffered from the failure to 'tidy up' following the migration of Kidderminster town centre to Weavers Wharf and Crossley Retail Park.</p> <p>Retail premises and the courts building have been empty for 8 /9 years - the regeneration of such sites require</p>	The OAHN is commissioned by the Council to identify Housing Needs. We will work with Neighbouring Authorities through the duty to cooperate and follow NPPF guidance with regards to Green Belt.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>radical solutions for alternative use that reduce any need to build on the Green Belt.</p> <p>Unnecessary decisions are being taken now e.g. in 1999 who could have predicted the impacts of the 2007/08 economic collapse or changes caused by online shopping (indeed, the plan itself demonstrates an inability to predict /understand short term population levels in the District).</p> <p>The plan fails in its stated aim to "to use a robust and up-to-date evidence base to ensure that the local plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area" . Instead it aims to justify what developers want to deliver rather than meet the needs of Kidderminster residents.</p> <p>Previous attempts to build an Eastern relief road have failed - the plan fails to present evidence based data that supports it in economic or environmental terms - at the consultation session I was informed this would be a single carriageway 40 mph road following the same route as the existing road from the Worcester Road through Mustow Green to the Birmingham Road - is it really a relief road at all?</p> <p>Whilst constructing a new school in the Spennells area appears attractive this (together with the promise of the 'relief road' shouldn't be the determining factor when opting to build on the Green Belt – other options should</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>be sought.</p> <p>Many people commute into / and out of Kidderminster now (hence the railway station development) - and have done so for many years. This situation equally relates to the areas covered by the LEPs identified in the plan.</p> <p>Whilst economic development in Kidderminster will be welcome - past experience shows this will take time – in the meantime people will continue to travel.</p> <p>Immediate need is for fresh radical thinking that optimises the use of brown field sites throughout the LEP areas for residential use and enables Kidderminster itself to become a modern, contained and attractive town centre that incorporates retail leisure and residential opportunities rather than pursue outdated models from the past - 'mixed use' communicates little other than the elements of 'wishful thinking' so often reported in the local press over numerous years.</p>	
Rentplus	<a href="#">LPPO1111</a>	Affordable Housing	Comment	Enclosed with these consultation responses is an Affordable Housing Statement by Tetlow King Planning setting out the model's compliance with the NPPF definition of affordable housing and how this should be incorporated into local plans to boost supply and meet local needs. We ask that this be read alongside our representation so that the Council's approach to negotiating housing takes into account this innovative model which has the capacity to improve delivery and to	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>meet high levels of local housing need and aspirations of home ownership.</p> <p>Rentplus is delivering rent to buy housing that meets local peoples’ needs and aspirations across England, in partnership with local planning authorities and Registered Providers, allocating housing through the local choice based lettings scheme and targeted lettings plans. Those developments provide homes at an affordable rent for those expecting to purchase in 5, 10, 15 or 20 years, with a 10% gifted deposit to assist purchase.</p> <p>Flexible policies and pragmatic responses to individual applications elsewhere in England have helped people move out of inappropriate housing; 30% of those moving into a recent Rentplus scheme left social and affordable rented properties, releasing those homes for families in greater need. People have also been able to leave the private rented sector, leave parent’s homes, and gain independence and security of tenure by accessing property with an affordable rent. The model would deliver clear benefits to many in the District who are unable to afford to buy and cannot currently save towards a future purchase.</p>	
West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium	<a href="#">LPPO1338</a>	Affordable Housing	Comment	Our clients’ principal concern is to optimise the provision of affordable housing and to ensure the evolution and preparation of consistent policies that help deliver the wider economic and social outcomes needed throughout the region. As significant developers and investors in local people, HARPs are well placed to	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<p>contribute to local plan objectives and act as long term partners in the community.</p> <p>Our comments are intended to be constructive, to ensure the policies are found sound at examination.</p>	
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPP01496</a>	Housing principles	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All people should have access to housing appropriate to their needs that is affordable, secure and comfortable. We believe that this can be met by a balanced mix of tenures and providers, varying according to people’s circumstances and preferences.</li> <li>• The provision of housing should include the construction of new homes, conversion of existing buildings to homes and the refurbishment of empty buildings. Priority should be given to the maintenance and improvement of existing properties where they can be improved in line with the local energy plan and to adequate levels of energy and water efficiency.</li> <li>• Large numbers of empty homes are a waste of a valuable resource, and blight neighbourhoods. The Local Authority should aim for no more than 0.5% of homes to be empty for more than six months, and should draw up registers of empty properties. There should be a proactive use of Empty Dwelling Management Orders and work with self-help co-operatives to bring homes into use.</li> </ul>	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 8: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local authorities should also address under-occupation through encouraging mutual exchange of homes, helping to match people who want to downsize with those who need more space, and providing more homes suitable for people to downsize into such as smaller social rented homes for elderly people. Successful schemes such as “Seaside and Country Homes” should be extended to people in all housing tenures, and to all local authorities.</li> <li>• We would like to see new homes and refurbishments done to the highest of efficiency standards. These would use low-impact materials, especially reused and recycled materials, to minimise the lifecycle embodied greenhouse gases, energy, water and other resources used in the construction of buildings and over the lifecycle of the materials. In addition, homes must be energy (e.g. Passivhaus Standard) and water efficient, and also incorporating comfort standards which address ergonomics, sound, privacy and light, so that homes are places of retreat.</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	<a href="#">LPP0950</a>	Policy 9	Comment	To provide support for indoor recreational opportunities. Add to point 6: Contributing to a high quality, safe and convenient walking and cycling network and providing opportunities for <u>both indoor and outdoor</u> recreation and sport.	Agree with comment. Amend policy wording at point 6 to include both indoor and outdoor sport and recreation.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPP01056</a>	Policy 9	Comment	The health and wellbeing benefits of access to green space and nature are well known and should be captured by this policy. Recommend additional bullet point be added to the policy making reference to the need for development to include and provide access to biodiverse Green Infrastructure.	Agree that policy should have additional bullet point - <b><i>ensuring development includes or provides access to biodiverse Green Infrastructure.</i></b>
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01149</a>	Policy 9	Comment	We welcome the inclusion of a policy on health and wellbeing which will, subject to certain amendments, help to meet the health-related challenges facing Wyre Forest district, including high levels of obesity, mental health problems, and an ageing population. Given the particular challenges arising from an ageing population in Wyre Forest and the need to plan for dementia-friendly environments, consideration could be given to including a separate policy on these issues, or having separate parts within Policy 9.  The wide breadth of health and wellbeing matters included in the policy is generally welcomed, although this does mean that some parts of the policy duplicate other parts of the WFLP or are not specific enough. Much of the current content is too vague, and feels closer to a list of broad aims and objectives that would be more appropriate as introductory text. The following specific changes are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We welcome the County Council’s support for the inclusion of a health and well being policy.</li> <li>• The policy will be amended to specifically mention the needs of those with dementia.</li> <li>• Part 2 - Following discussions, policy wording has been amended to read ‘Providing energy efficient housing that is affordable and of high quality’</li> <li>• Part 3 has been removed from the amended policy as this is covered elsewhere in the Local Plan</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We support Part 2 but feel that it would benefit from being made more specific. Building Regulations ensure that new developments meet a certain standard of energy efficiency. In addition if there is a desire to specific a requirement which is over and above the standard approach this needs to be specified.</li> <li>• Part 3 would benefit from further detail to clarify whether it is seeking to improve availability of jobs or sustainable physical access to places of employment through the, for example provision of walking and cycling networks. This section could be expanded to include improvements to employment developments which can contribute towards health and wellbeing of employees. Developments should be designed to create opportunities for physical activity and working environments which support social interaction and relaxation of their employees. These measures could include the provision of open/green spaces, recreational facilities or on-site cycling storage/changing facilities etc.</li> <li>• Part 4 would benefit from expansion as further details as it is unclear as to whether this is referring to domestic matters or business / industrial waste and recycling. This is critical because they have different health and well-being impacts and regulatory regimes. There is some potential for non-domestic matters for overlap with the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part 4 has been removed from the amended policy as this is covered elsewhere in the Local Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All new developments will be designed to promote walking for everyday trips with easy safe and convenient pedestrian access to shops, schools, open space and bus routes,</li> <li>○ Part 6 seems to cover two linked but separate issues, with the second section better matched to Part 10.</li> <li>○ Part 7 - This policy has now been expanded to read as follows:</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Locating food and drink premises, hot food takeaways, bars, restaurants, cafés and other non-food and drink uses</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Worcestershire Waste Core Strategy which will need to be taken into account in refining and targeting this part of the policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement to accessibility relating to sections 5, 6, 8 and 9 of this policy.</li> <li>• Accessibility is a major consideration in relation to health and wellbeing in the context of built environment. The provision of community uses, health services and facilities, green spaces or allotments can work for all the population groups only when they are accessible in terms of distance, ability and quality of their travel. This is why the creation of walkable environments to improve resident's access to these areas by foot is important. Further to these enhancing opportunities for the use of public transport should be encouraged through the Local Plan.</li> <li>• Part 6 seems to cover two linked but separate issues, with the second section better matched to Part 10.</li> <li>• We welcome Part 7 but suggest greater specificity over how and where these uses should be limited. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ - The target limit of the overall proportion of units of particular uses in a given location;</li> <li>○ - Limit of particular types of premises in proximity to schools and community centres;</li> <li>○ - Limit of particular uses in proximity to areas of identified health deprivation and areas where obesity levels are higher than average;</li> <li>○ - Limiting those premises for which negative</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>which may potentially have negative health impacts at least 400m from a youth or community facility. This will be prioritised in areas with high levels of health deprivation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part 9 - Agree that community orchards could also be added.</li> <li>• Part 11 - Social interaction has been added into the previous part 5 (now part 4)</li> <li>• Air pollution is covered elsewhere at chapter 16</li> <li>• A Health and wellbeing SPD will be produced following the adoption of the Local Plan. This will cover many of these details affecting people living with dementia and how the environment can be altered to aid them.</li> <li>• The requirement for HIAs is now included in the amended policy at part 3. This will apply to residential developments of 25 or more dwellings and non-residential developments of</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>health impacts were identified in Health Impact Assessments.</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council can provide good practice examples and would welcome further discussion on this issue as the policy develops.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part 8 may need more detail. Community orchards could also be included here.</li> <li>• Most of Part 9 is already covered in Parts 5 and 6. The only element of Part 9 that is not covered elsewhere is social interaction. This is a valuable inclusion, and could be added to one of the other parts of the policy if 9 were to be deleted.</li> <li>• Part 11 considers air quality, but we would welcome further attention being given to the links between air quality and health. In particular, reference should be made to the document 'Air pollution: outdoor air quality and health - June 2017' published by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. This document covers:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ siting and designing new buildings, facilities and estates to reduce the need for motorised travel;</li> <li>○ minimising the exposure of vulnerable groups to air pollution by not siting buildings (such as schools, nurseries and care homes) in areas where pollution levels will be high;</li> <li>○ siting living accommodation away from roadsides;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>0.25Ha and over.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Health SPD will be produced following the adoption of the Local Plan.</li> </ul>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ - avoiding the creation of street and building configurations (such as deep street canyons) that encourage pollution to build up where people spend time;</li> <li>○ including landscape features such as trees and vegetation in open spaces or as 'green' walls or roofs where this does not restrict ventilation;</li> <li>○ including information in the plan about how structures such as buildings and other physical barriers will affect the distribution of air pollutants;</li> <li>○ consider action to reduce and limit vehicle idling around schools and other vulnerable populations.</li> </ul> <p>There are a variety of issues that may be too detailed for inclusion in the policy itself, but which should nevertheless be considered when planning for development. Many of these apply to the principles of planning and designing dementia-friendly environments, as many more people will live with dementia as the population of Wyre Forest ages, and we should act now to plan for these challenges. We recommend that these issues are taken into account as the WFLP develops, and it may also be helpful to outline some or all of those considered most relevant in the reasoned justification and/or in an accompanying SPD (discussed further below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The provision of accessible open spaces and walkable</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>neighbourhoods can encourage and facilitate increased physical activity amongst the elderly and support their social interaction. It is crucial that these spaces and routes are safe and well-maintained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public footpaths should also be well-lit and evenly surfaced.</li> <li>• Where there are changes in ground levels, the transition should be gradual. Where steps are unavoidable, the provision of railings is necessary.</li> <li>• Accessible public transport links, such as bus stops within walking distance from people's homes, are also crucial in maintaining the independence of the elderly.</li> <li>• People living with dementia frequently stay at home because they do not feel safe to leave their house because the outdoor environment feels unsafe and unfamiliar. The provision of safe, well-lit, segregated and walkable routes connecting local green spaces and essential amenities could improve the likelihood of those with dementia continuing their everyday lives as part of the community. For example, being able to easily reach the park could offer the opportunity to spend quiet and relaxing time among other people.</li> <li>• It is important that pathways contain seating areas in strategic places, such as at crossroads. People living with dementia might take a little bit longer to remember their destination or how to get there. Circular routes provide opportunities to return to the same point if lost or confused. The design of street</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>furniture should be kept simple and familiar to avoid it being mistaken for some other object. The positioning of street furniture, such as placing benches under street trees to allow shading during hot weather, is also important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paving and tarmac should be plain and non-reflective and should contrast with walls in colour and texture. Dementia affects people's perception of their surroundings and different surfaces. Dark areas might appear to them as a hole in the ground, whilst glaring/shining surfaces can look like water or slippery surfaces.</li> <li>• People living with dementia might feel confused when a lot of information is projected at them at the same time. They generally function better amongst objects in the environment that are simple and familiar. This is why sites should be well signed using a tonal contrast of colours with a clear and simple font.</li> </ul> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment (HIA)</b></p> <p>We would like to reiterate the value that HIAs can play in planning for healthy developments/environments. HIA ensures that the effects of development on both health and health inequalities are considered and addressed during the planning process. The importance of planning for health and the use of HIAs in planning is promoted through national planning policy and guidance. The National Planning Policy Framework recognises the need to understand and "take</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>account of the health status and needs of the local population including expected future changes, and any information about relevant barriers to improving health and well-being."</p> <p>Additionally, the national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) recognises that, in relation to planning applications, HIA is a useful tool to identify where significant impacts on the health of local people are expected. A requirement for, or strong recommendation for HIAs in the Local Plan could help to foster its use and lead to healthier developments. Worcestershire County Council can provide good practice examples and would welcome further discussion on HIA as the WFLP progresses.</p> <p><b>Health Supplementary Planning Document</b></p> <p>We recommend that a Supplementary Planning Document is produced to support Policy 9 to provide detailed guidance on how developments can address the health and wellbeing challenges facing Wyre Forest district. Worcestershire County Council has a successful track record of working collaboratively with district councils on producing SPDs, including the 'Planning for Health in South Worcestershire' SPD, which provides guidance on interpreting the health-related policies of the SWDP. This SPD will be adopted late September 2017 and a draft can be accessed at <a href="http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=12262">http://www.swdevelopmentplan.org/?page_id=12262</a>.</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council would like to discuss with</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				WFDC the opportunity to develop a similar document.	
Sport England	<a href="#">LPPO212</a>	Policy 9 - Health and Wellbeing	Comment	<p>General support for this policy and its breadth.</p> <p>Sport England would advocate embedding 'Active Design' within the policy (see link below) and within the list under 9.9 I would suggest you add: built sports facilities such as swimming pools and sports halls and also encourage access to schools by the community to maximise the value of existing sports provision to the local community,</p> <p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/">https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/</a></p> <p>Cross ref. to any built sports facility strategy and the Playing Pitch Strategy would also be recommended to help inform local infrastructure protection/provision and enhancement.</p>	<p>Agree that reference should be made to Sport England Active Design document.</p> <p>Add an additional bullet point to Policy 9 as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">13. Encouraging sport and physical activity through the design and layout of development by embedding Sport England’s Principles of Active Design</p> <p>At Para. 9.9 B add following wording to refer to built facilities:</p> <p>... including built sports facilities such as swimming pools and sports halls and also encourage access to schools by the community to maximise the value of existing sports provision to the local community.</p> <p>After final sentence add cross references to adopted Wyre Forest Playing Pitch Strategy and Action</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					Plan and the Indoor and Built Facilities Strategy
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	<a href="#">LPP01208</a>	Policy 9	Comment	Should this policy cover GP/Health facilities? We could do with a hook somewhere for this linked to Planning Obs SPD, as NHS Redditch & Bromsgrove are getting savvy about requesting S106 contributions.	The provision of health facilities and GP surgeries is covered by chapter 20 Community Facilities.
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">LPP01314</a>	Policy 9 - Point 2	Comment	“Providing energy efficient housing to help reduce fuel poverty”. This policy applies only to new housing stock but there is a need to improve the energy efficiency of older stock particularly privately owned dwellings.	Agree that older privately owned housing stock often requires energy efficiency measures. Unfortunately, this is beyond the remit of the Local Plan.
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">LPP01319</a>	Policy 9 - Point 11	Comment	“----- and reducing car dependency” This is a repeated theme throughout the document but there is little indication of how this will be achieved other than references to “sustainable transport”	By designing well-connected attractive safe streets, footpaths and cycle networks which people will want to use, physical activity and mental health will improve and car dependency should be reduced for local journeys.  At para.9.3 add above sentence after opening sentence.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01362</a>	Policy 9	Comment	Some words should be deleted from the opening sentence, such that it becomes "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 by".	Agree that this does not read well. Amend opening sentence as suggested.  "Development should help maximise opportunities to improve

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					quality of life to make it easier for people in Wyre Forest District to lead healthy, active lifestyles by".
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPP01405</a>	Policy 9 - point 11	Comment	“reducing car dependency” is a repeated theme throughout the document but there is little indication of how this will be achieved other than vague references to “sustainable transport”. The build of fringe suburbs will inevitably increase car use, in contrast to provision of homes in town centres, where walking is possible to most services and shops.	Where possible, sites within the town centres giving easy access to shops and services will be redeveloped for housing. Any large sites on the urban fringes will be designed to encourage access to facilities other than by car by either being located within reasonable walking distance of existing shops and services or new facilities will be provided on the development itself. Developments can be designed to discourage car travel and encourage walking and cycling by providing direct routes to key facilities
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPP01676</a>	Policy 9	Comment	The Worcestershire Housing Partnership Plan outlines the significant analysis of the links between health and wellbeing and the quality and affordability of different tenure housing. On page 11 of the Plan, it notes that social / affordable rented homes are the ‘healthiest homes’.  In view of this, we would recommend that Policy 9 of the Local Plan Review Document reflects this established research and signposts the role that Registered Provider’s play in improving health and wellbeing outcomes.	Comments are noted. Amend Policy 9 bullet point 1 to read as ‘providing healthy homes that meet the needs of future occupiers, including older people and those with disabilities which are both affordable and of a high quality’  Add additional sentences at end of para.9.2 ‘Housing has a significant impact on health and well-being.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					Social and affordable rent homes have consistently been shown to be the healthiest with private rented dwellings having the worst issues around damp and poor heating.'
	<a href="#">LPP01773</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	Development would not be beneficial to health.	This comment is in response to a proposed housing site in Far Forest. For response see Policy 35 BR/RO/7
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP0846</a>	Policy 9 Health and Wellbeing	Support	Support for Policy 9.	Support for Health Policy is welcomed
Place Partnership Ltd	<a href="#">LPP01090</a>	Policy 9 Health and Wellbeing	Support	We welcome and support part (5) of this policy, which states that development should be designed to minimise the potential for crime and anti-social behaviour and improve community safety.	Support for point 5 relating to design and community safety is noted and welcomed
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01525</a>	Policy 9	Support	Aspirations supported.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP02632</a>	Policy 9 Health and Wellbeing	Support	We support the following:  <b>Policy 9 Health and Wellbeing.</b>	Support is noted
	<a href="#">LPP04853</a>	Policy 9	Support	We support Policy 9.	Support is noted
	<a href="#">LPP03236</a>	Pages 66-68 Health and Well Being	Object	There is much support in the Rock Parish for the development of new homes for young people of the villages of Rock and Far Forest and immediate vicinity, also for retired and elderly and less able parish residents wanting to	Comments are noted. Welcome support for limited development in main villages in Rock parish to cater for local needs of both young and

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>downsize to accommodation more appropriate to their needs thus releasing larger existing properties into the market.</p> <p>There is little local employment within a four-mile radius of Rock/Far Forest. Bewdley 5 miles, Kidderminster 8 Miles, Birmingham 26 miles, public transport links are appalling with one bus every 2 hrs to and from Ludlow.</p> <p>The nearest doctors' surgeries are in Cleobury Mortimer or Bewdley both 4 miles away. The nearest ambulance station is Kidderminster some 8 miles away or 20 mins travel time in an emergency. The nearest Fire Station is Kidderminster some 8 miles away, some 20 minutes travel time in an emergency. The nearest Police station is Stourport, some 6 miles away and 15 minutes travel time in an emergency.</p>	<p>elderly. Appreciate that there are no medical facilities within the Parish but limited development would help to maintain what services do exist.</p>
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1363</a>	Paragraph 9.2	Comment	In "peoples", the apostrophe should be before the "s", as "people" is already plural.	Noted. Punctuation will be amended.
	<a href="#">LPPO3843</a>	Paragraph 9.2	Object	I object to the Council's strategy for development, there is evidence that the Council remains at odds with the idealised statements made, but is incapable of delivering in practise. The town centre is run down and unattractive with is no 24/7 presence as a result of poor planning. I have little confidence in these proposals.	Officers accept that there have been mistakes made in the past. However, we do not agree that the run-down appearance of parts of Kidderminster town centre can be laid wholly at the door of town planning. The economic down turn has badly affected many towns. Conversion of many upper floors

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					and former office buildings is gradually transforming parts of the town centre and providing a 24/7 presence. More restaurants and cafes mean the town centre has a more family-friendly evening economy. This Local Plan Review aims to put health and well-being back into the core of planning where it originally sat and deliver development that will give people a better quality of life.
	<a href="#">LPP04477</a>	Section 9	Object	For 9.2 How can a very small bit of grass in a large housing development create a feeling of health when compared to Green Belt open space? The whole of Kidderminster and Spennells benefit from the field and Green Belt. You are taking away dog walking and bike riding facilities and will be facilitating bad health.	Officers appreciate your comments but do not agree. Much of the Green Belt around Kidderminster has no public access as there are no footpaths or bridleways. Any development will be carefully designed around significant areas of green infrastructure to provide enhanced access for walking and cycling for both existing and new residents.
	<a href="#">LPP03687</a>	9.3	Object	Where is your evidence for 9.3?	There have been many studies done looking at how the design of new developments has had a positive impact on the health and well-being of residents and visitors.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01153</a>	Paragraph 9.5, Table 9.0.1	Comment	The first indicator in Table 9.0.1 is on GCSE achievement which is something that most people would not directly connect with health and well being. A reordering of the table would be helpful to deliver the message.	Agree with comment. Not sure how relevant educational attainment is to health. Educational attainment is highlighted as an issue affecting the district in the Local Plan Review. Further data can be found in the Sustainability Appraisal. Reorder table with this data at the bottom.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01364</a>	Paragraph 9.6	Comment	The fractions here should be written out in words.	Agree – amend wording to two-thirds and one-third respectively.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01365</a>	Paragraph 9.8	Comment	In the second sentence, the comma after "locally" should be deleted.	Amend sentence to read 'One local example is...'
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01154</a>	Paragraph 9.9, part E	Comment	The statement in Part E that "car parking provision should be minimised" should be amended to "car parking standards should be appropriate, and meet WCC car parking standards contained within the highways design guide available at: <a href="http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/1847/highways_design_guide.pdf">http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/1847/highways_design_guide.pdf</a> "  These standards are currently being updated and will be adopted from October 2017.	Amend text to read 'Car parking provision should be appropriate'. Put link in a footnote.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">LPP01315</a>	Paragraph 9.9	Comment	Many of the six key areas which affect health will be dependent on agreement with developers to provide these facilities. This is particularly important with large developments such as the proposed Spennells extension. 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.	Comments are noted. Masterplanning for key developments are all based around green infrastructure.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPP01479</a>	Para 9.9	Comment	Many of the six key areas which affect health will be dependent on agreement with developers to provide these facilities. This is particularly important with large developments such as the proposed Spennells extension. 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.	Comments are noted. Masterplanning for key developments are all based around green infrastructure.
	<a href="#">LPP03845</a>	Paragraph 9.9B	Object	I object to the Council's strategy which is at odds with this statement with its proposal to build on Green Belt.	Officers appreciate your comments but do not agree. Any development on Green Belt land will be carefully designed around significant areas of green infrastructure to provide enhanced access for walking and cycling for both existing and new residents.
	<a href="#">LPP0612</a>	All	Comment	These figures are all average or poor. You should strive for the best.	Officers agree that the figures for Wyre Forest are very poor but planning is only one of many influences on lifestyle. Future

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					developments should be designed to encourage a more active lifestyle from an early age.
Summerfield Against Land Transformation	<a href="#">LPP01617</a>	Health	Comment	We acknowledge the health issues identified in the draft Plan and would welcome greater joint working with appropriate health bodies to address these challenges. The desire to stimulate a 'night economy' focusing upon eating and drinking is somewhat at odds with these concerns.	Further meetings have been arranged with health advisors to discuss the challenges highlighted.  Comments re the 'night economy' are noted. . Development of more active leisure is planned for Kidderminster town centre
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPP01478</a>	Health and Wellbeing	Comment	<p>There are already well-used and designated Public Footpaths and Rights of Way across the fields that the Local Plan recognises as being intensively used by local residents of all ages – with the positive effects this produces upon their Health and Wellbeing.</p> <p>Natural open spaces have positive effects 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. Children with access to safe green spaces are more likely to be physically active and less likely to be overweight.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Comments on benefits of access to open countryside are noted. Through releasing land for development, new access routes will be opened up where there is currently little if any public access. Existing public rights of way will be retained and green corridors expanded. Officers are well aware of the health benefits of open spaces and detailed masterplans and site specific criteria will be drawn up as part of the next stage of the Local Plan consultation process.</p> <p>Discussions are being held with health officials regarding how</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>The Sustainability Appraisal (May 2017) 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. We 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>Kidderminster has higher obesity levels than the national average (Wyre Forest Public Health Profile 2016), a position which would be exacerbated by reducing access to local fields. The new Wyre Forest Leisure Centre has been moved out of the town centre, reducing access to Kidderminster residents, especially people without their own transport.</p> <p>Other threats to the health and wellbeing of residents arising from development of Green Belt adjacent to existing homes include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed new road (Eastern Relief road) causing increased traffic noise, air pollution, light pollution and additional traffic vibration to Spennells’ residents.</li> <li>2. Increased demand on infrastructure including medical facilities and schools.</li> </ol>	<p>obesity problems can be tackled through the planning process.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				3. 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).	
Ramblers Association	<a href="#">LPPO4128</a>	Policy 9 Health and Wellbeing	Comment	<p>We are pleased to see that you have identified the link between walking and cycling and health and wellbeing. However, we would have liked to see a clear reference to the intention of the District Council to use its planning powers to protect public rights of way and the enhancement of the network as a means to achieve its objectives relating to health and wellbeing. Point 5 of the Policy which deals with open space refers to the need to ensure that they are designed to be safe. The same need is also valid for public rights of way and cycleways if they are to be used by a wide range of people.</p> <p>The Reasoned Justification makes no reference to walking and cycling except in relation to places of work. We think that this should be expanded to include the journey to school, to retail centres, leisure facilities etc.</p>	<p>Agree with comments. Expand point 5 of Policy 9 to read as ‘... safe and attractive public areas, green spaces, footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes which minimise the potential for crime ...’</p> <p>At para.9.9 A Movement and Access:- add additional phrase ‘... walking and cycling networks service schools, shops, workplaces and leisure facilities; ’</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4145</a>	Section 9	Comment	<p>The Local plan is contradictory, saying how important it is for the community to have green space for both physical and mental wellbeing but taking this away from the people at the eastern side of Kidderminster.</p> <p><b>Health inequalities</b> Wyre Forest -District Life expectancy is 10.8 years lower for</p>	<p>Comments are noted. Do not agree that those on the eastern side of Kidderminster will have their green space taken away by the Local Plan proposals. The proposals will include increased access to natural open space with a network of footpaths/cycleways linking key</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>men and 6.5 years lower for women in the most deprived areas of Wyre Forest than in the least deprived areas.</p> <p>Child health - Wyre Forest and Wychavon have significantly higher percentages of children with excess weight for Reception year than the Worcestershire average in the 3 years pooled data. 2012/13 – 2014/15 In Year 6, 21.7% (177) of children are classified as obese.</p> <p>Adult health - Estimated levels of adult excess weight are worse than the England average.</p> <p>Local priorities - Priorities in Wyre Forest include improving mental health and wellbeing, reducing harm from alcohol, and increasing physical activity. Reducing Green Belt is totally contradictory to these local priorities</p> <p>The Green Belt is an important aid in reducing urban pollution, any reduction in its land mass will impact ultimately on peoples' health.</p> <p>The Council proposing to reduce 2.4% of Green Belt around the east of Kidderminster in Option A. This is not only to build approximately 1700 houses, it is to build a new road – Eastern Relief Road, which it says will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Enable S-NE traffic to by-pass Kidderminster altogether en route to M5 motorway and Birmingham</li> <li>b. Help relieve congestion on A449 and in Kidderminster the river crossing (Ring</li> </ul>	<p>facilities. Much of the land to the east of the town has little formal public access at the moment.</p> <p>Table 9.0.1 will be updated once the Wyre Forest Health Profile for 2018 is published in July.</p> <p>Proposals for a relief road linking the A449 A448 and A456 are no longer proposed in the Local Plan Review.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Road, Horsefair etc)</p> <p>When questioned at a drop-in session the planner said that this will be a single carriageway, crossing the railway opposite the vehicle testing centre on Worcester Road and crossing the field adjacent parallel to Stanklyn Lane. It will take lorries and high-sided vehicles unable to go under the 'black bridge'. She said that she saw that houses might be clustered along it rather than 'filling the field'.</p> <p>A new road carrying traffic through previous green fields and new houses totally contradicts the recent Government paper: UK plan for tackling roadside nitrogen dioxide concentrations - An overview July 2017 - The government's ambition for a better environment and cleaner air</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We pledge to be the first generation to leave the environment in a better state than we inherited it.</li> <li>2. Clean air is one of the most basic requirements of a healthy environment for us all to live, work, and bring up families. Whilst air quality has improved significantly in recent decades, and will continue to improve thanks to the action we have already taken, there are some parts of our country where there are unacceptable levels of air pollution. This can come from a range of different sources and activities. Many everyday activities such as industrial processes, farming, transport, generating energy and heating homes can have a detrimental effect on air quality. This is a problem we need to tackle.</li> </ol>	
	<a href="#">LPPO4727</a>	Section 9	Comment	As far as I can see in this section there is no reference to how access to health professionals and hospital provision will	This section looks at how planning can impact on people's health and

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>reflect the increased population brought about by all this additional housing. How and where will the extra Doctors and Doctor’s surgeries be generated within this plan and what will happen to local Hospitals which cannot cope with the health of the present residents of the area?</p> <p>I am sure that the Council response that this is not their problem to resolve. However, I think that we are all aware of the strain that immigration has already put on health and education across the country and the resentment this has caused. What will happen when it takes residents even longer to see Doctors or have treatment in hospital? It will negate all the wonderful words in this section about health (9.2) and the requirement to improve health, social interaction and reduce health inequalities.</p>	<p>encourage a healthy lifestyle.</p> <p>Health services provision is covered by the Community facilities chapter. As part of the strategic allocations in this Local Plan sites for additional GP surgeries will be allocated. New 2-form entry primary schools are also proposed as part of these sites.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04863</a>	Section 9	Comment	<p>There are numerous comments in the review relating to the high percentage of overweight and obese people in the area, including children however there is no mention at all about medical services. It is proposed that some 6000 homes are to be built in Wyre Forest which would equate to an increase in population of circa 20,000 for which access to local doctors and dentists will be required. Currently it is virtually impossible to find a NHS dentist in Kidderminster. On top of this there is the need for hospital services to serve residents in Worcestershire as a whole. It is assumed that other district councils are also looking at housing plans then there is the possibility that the population of Worcestershire could increase by more than 80,000. Serving the area are three main hospitals in Worcester, Kidderminster and Redditch.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. As part of the proposals, 2 additional doctors’ surgeries are planned for the urban extensions in Kidderminster together with replacement facilities in Stourport-on-Severn.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Kidderminster hospital was some years ago downgraded and some services from Redditch have been moved to Worcester. It has been reported for some time that the service provided by Worcester Hospital is of an inadequate standard with a status of "special measures" being applied. However more recently this hospital was defined as the worst performing hospital in England. Therefore how is it possible to cope with an aging population and a potential significant increase in population and why has there been no reference to this issue in the review.</p>	
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3684</a></p>	<p>Section 9</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Use of open space and greenfield is beneficial to health. This section is at odds with what the plan is proposing. Health will be affected by increased congestion, lack of open space, overcrowding, increase in anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Table 9.01, 9.6 and 9.9 are all evidence for keeping the Green Belt and the fields not concreting over it. You state in the report that <i>Open spaces, play and recreation - planned network of both blue and green infrastructure; easily accessible natural green space of varying sizes; safe and easily accessible play areas which are overlooked; sports and leisure facilities designed for use by all</i></p> <p>This statement is at odds with the actions you are proposing. The greenfields serve this facility.</p>	<p>Officers do not agree that proposals will lead to a lack of accessible open space. Any new developments on Greenfield sites will be designed around an enhanced green infrastructure with natural open space served by walking and cycling routes. Any land released from the Green Belt will have to demonstrate enhanced public access. Many of these areas do not currently have any public rights of way crossing them. These new developments will be designed to encourage both new and existing residents to use the open space with a network of circular walking routes created across the sites with links to key facilities.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 9: HEALTH**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP01710</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already had an increase of large vehicles using the roads.</li> <li>• Concerns about safety of other routes onto the main road.</li> <li>• School is full to capacity.</li> <li>• Public services are inadequate.</li> </ul>	This site in New Road Far Forest is no longer being considered for allocation for housing development owing to a number of different factors including biodiversity and highways issues.
	<a href="#">LPP01724</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on health</li> </ul>	This site in New Road Far Forest is no longer being considered for allocation for housing development owing to a number of different factors including biodiversity and highways issues.
	<a href="#">LPP01729</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<p>Objects for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No employment locally - will lead to people travelling to work by car which is bad for the environment.</li> <li>• No doctors in the village - closest ones already near capacity.</li> </ul>	This site in New Road Far Forest is no longer being considered for allocation for housing development owing to a number of different factors including biodiversity and highways issues.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Horton Estates Ltd	<a href="#">LPP0863</a>	Policy 10A	Comment	Policy seeks to safeguard/reserve existing employment land for employment-generating uses. No objection but the current wording is not flexible enough to allow alternative uses where there is no reasonable prospect of employment reuse. This is a specific requirement of para. 22 of the NPPF, which states that planning policies should avoid the long-term protection of sites allocated for employment use "where there is no reasonable prospect of reuse." Request more flexible wording to provide clear criteria for assessing whether employment land is appropriate for release for alternative use(s).	The wording of the policy has been given due consideration. It is considered that the wording conforms with NPPF 2018 and has flexibility.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01527</a>	Policy 10A	Comment	<p>Analysis of employment land requirement seems logical and is a fair reflection of what future land demand could look like in Wyre Forest if past trends continue.</p> <p>Concern with the 40ha employment land requirement is that it does not appear to take into account if Wyre Forest sees stronger economic growth under a "policy-on" scenario. Wyre Forest District could need around 60ha of employment land. By figure of 40ha, a risk that the economy of Wyre Forest remains stagnant and falls behind other parts of the region. Worcestershire LEP's Strategic Economic Plan has a vision to grow the LEP economy by 25,000 jobs by 2025. It is unlikely that Wyre Forest will make much of a contribution</p>	As you correctly state Wyre Forest District Council commissioned an Employment Land Review (ELR) in 2016 to assess economic development needs across the District. The findings were that up to 40 hectares of employment land was required within the District. In 2018 an update to the ELR was commissioned to ensure that the requirement for employment land is up to date.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				to this target if its economy only grows under baseline conditions. Consideration should therefore be given to increasing the quantum of employment land brought forward by the Local Plan.	
	<a href="#">LPP04753</a>	Policy 10A	Comment	<p><b>Objective: To determine the need for industrial/commercial units and where to be sited (40 hectares of employment space allegedly required by 2034):</b> A reassessment of the questionable need for local industrial/commercial development should be undertaken. The three Wyre Forest towns are primarily a dormitory for the industrial and commercial conurbations of Birmingham and the Black Country and, to a lesser extent, Wolverhampton and Worcester. Local unemployment is not a massive issue.</p> <p>The Council should take into account its previous experience of planning failure ... industrial and commercial units (including new builds) having remained unoccupied for indefinite periods of time.</p> <p>Take account of ‘Britons’ and ‘Victoria Carpets’, which will make manufacturing space available in due course.</p> <p>The projection of 40 hectares may well be an over-estimate?</p>	The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes the Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><b>Objective: To promote economic development:</b> Wyre Forest has not been an industrial area since the demise of the carpet industry, since which time, it's been a desirable District in which to live and raise families. Many residents have their homes here to take advantage of its green and pleasant surroundings, avoiding the industrial sprawl of just a few miles away. It's doubtful that a poll of public opinion would support any dramatic rebranding to encourage more industrial/commercial development than is essential to provide for a moderate growth of population.</p> <p>It's important to recognise the massive government expenditure expected to develop the "Midlands Engine" and the probable availability of extensive employment opportunities within commuter range.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO5109</a>	Economic growth	Comment	If Planning is assuming that this projected increase in population will be the consequence of sustainable economic growth within the area, then there are no specific references in the report relating to which and what type of industries and businesses could be attracted to replace the declining carpet and ancillary industries.	The Local Authority wish to encourage a range of new business to the District and also to encourage the growth of existing businesses. The Local Authority commissioned an Employment Land Review (ELR) in 2016, updated in 2018 to assess how much employment land is required within the District.
	<a href="#">LPPO3849</a>	Policy 10A	Object	I object to the Council's strategy for development. It is completely unjustified to release a further	There are nine units at Easter Park, eight of

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				40Hectares of employment land when there is existing land which lies vacant. There are unused units on Easter Park that have laid empty since their construction. Any new units will also lay empty.	these are occupied.  The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.
	<a href="#">LPP01832</a>	Town Centre development	Comment	The hope of increasing prosperity in the Weavers Wharf and thus regenerate the old town centre is pie in the sky. Internet shopping will only to continue to increase and put pressures on retail shopping which will contract as a result.	Agree that retail patterns have changed due to changing shopping habits including the rise of internet shopping.  Policy 10B and Policy 22A consider alternative uses in the town centres. Policy 22A - In secondary shopping areas, support will be given for change of use of retail units to alternative uses such as leisure, recreation, employment and residential.
	<a href="#">LPP03796</a>	Policy 10B	Comment	The future of Kidderminster must start with rejuvenation of the town centre spreading outwards. The large units will never attract new business. The current financial climate would make the risk of undertaking a retail unit of that size too great. Breaking the buildings up into low rise apartments with small artisan retail units interspersed would be the best option. Include pockets of green space and trees, with seating. The	Retail has changed with the rise of internet shopping and as you state many retailers do not want large premises. Agree that the canal and tourism should be promoted to reach its potential and this is covered in other policies.  Policy 22A states that in secondary shopping areas support will be given for

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				local schools and college should be encouraged to run small businesses as part of educational programmes. Design students encouraged to group together and run a cooperative — showcasing their individual talents. The canal side and tourism exploited for its maximum potential. The access routes into the town centre need to be made safer and more attractive. On the protest march I noted the extent of the vandalism and stench in the underpass — I certainly wouldn't walk there alone or encourage my daughters or any tourist to.	change of use of retail units to alternative uses such as leisure, recreation and residential.
	<a href="#">LPP04754</a>	Policy 10B	Comment	<p><b><u>Objective: The sensitive development and redevelopment of Kidderminster town centre</u></b></p> <p>Kidderminster has lost its 'retail appeal' in recent years, due mainly to its empty shops, parking charges, competition from the Merry Hill Shopping Centre and, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, from the internet. This is unlikely to change but, with foresight, the situation presents an opportunity to create a more vibrant town centre, replacing redundant shops and offices with high density, affordable living accommodation, with a socially friendly infrastructure of pedestrian areas, clubs, bars, and restaurants, gardens, street furniture etc.</p>	<p>Agree that retail patterns have changed with the change in shopping habits including the rise of internet shopping.</p> <p>Policy 10B and Policy 22A consider alternative uses in the town centres.</p> <p>Policy 22A - In secondary shopping areas, support will be given for change of use of retail units to alternative uses such as leisure, recreation, employment and residential.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04879</a>	Policy 10B	Comment	Kidderminster lacks coherent planning. Many large premises are empty - the eyesore which is Crown House, and derelict Worcester street etc. With	Agree that retail patterns have changed with the change in shopping habits including the rise of internet shopping.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>imagination and planning much could be revitalised and used productively. Retail business will never be as it was 30 years ago. Scant recognition of these observations is made in the plan. Retail businesses should be downsized to reflect future demand, and the historical heritage buildings should be sympathetically developed, and there should be living accommodation built centrally based. If flats/small affordable housing were to be built on central town sites it would attract young professionals and entrepreneurs. The town centre would become vibrant again, with more leisure, restaurants, and tourist attractions centrally based. Our town has so much that is positive, with many aspects that make it still an attractive town to live in - the Safari Park, the SVR, the Carpet Museum, The Rose Theatre and the Bewdley Festival are examples. In addition there are thriving vibrant group activities ongoing, many choirs, choral societies, art groups, the Civic Society, a very active U3A, canals, rivers, golf courses, gyms, and new leisure centre to name but a few. This is a sound base for future development. Kidderminster could, with imagination and creative planning become a lovely town again where a diverse population would want to come to live, and visit as welcome tourists.</p>	<p>Crown House will be demolished and the area redeveloped.</p> <p>Agree that Kidderminster and wider area within the District have many assets, many attractions are listed in the tourism chapter 23.</p> <p>The Local Authority has considered alternative uses to retail in Kidderminster town centre. Policy 22A supports in secondary shopping areas proposals for alternative uses such as leisure, residential, recreation and employment.</p>
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01528</a>	Policy 10B	Comment	No comments.	Noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1057</a>	Policy 10B	Comment	We are pleased to support the third bullet point set out in this policy and in particular the weight it gives to protecting the natural environment in towns from the adverse effects of development.	Support for the third bullet point in Policy 10B is noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1155</a>	Policy 10B	Comment	The second bullet point states that "New development for retail, commercial and leisure uses should follow a sequential approach and be directed to Kidderminster town centre as the strategic centre in the District first followed by Stourport-on-Severn and Bewdley". Would this mean that no new retail development could be considered in Stourport or Bewdley unless Kidderminster is considered first through a sequential test?	Wording of this bullet point has been amended.
	<a href="#">LPPO613</a>	Policy 10B	Comment	People live in town centres, licensed premises should not operate after midnight. This becoming an increasing problem in Bewdley.	Comments and concerns are noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO938</a>	Policy 10B	Comment	We welcome the policy generally, but think it could be better expressed. A separate Retail paper accompanies this. We would suggest that the clustering of many non-residential uses in town centres should be encouraged, and most non-retail uses in residential areas should be discouraged. This is not intended to apply to ground floor protected retail frontages, but such protection should be limited to areas where true retail uses still predominate.	The Local Authority has considered alternative uses to retail in the town centre to enhance vitality in the secondary shopping areas and the following policies will support these alternative uses.  Policy 10B and Policy 22A consider alternative uses in the town centres. Policy 22A - In secondary shopping areas, support will be given for change of use of retail units

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					to alternative uses such as leisure, recreation, employment and residential.
Gemini Properties	<a href="#">LPP01194</a>	Policy 10B	Object	<p>Policy 10B Town Centre Development - sets out sequential approach directing such development to Kidderminster as the strategic centre in the first instance. Appendix A shows extent of Primary Shopping Area but does not identify extent of town centre boundary. The NPPF gives a clear distinction between the Primary Shopping Area and the Town Centre. This matter should be rectified by an amendment to the Primary Shopping Area plans in Appendix A to include a Town Centre boundary. In this regard, it is clear from the definition within the framework that the town centre boundary should extend beyond the primary shopping area and include additional surrounding land uses.</p> <p>Gemini Property's site at Park Lane (part of BHS/16) should be included within the Town Centre boundary. We consider that the existing policy KCA.WG2 - Park Lane Canal side should be retained and carried forward into the Local Plan. Indeed, additional flexibility should be added to the site in order to encourage its redevelopment and deliver a high quality scheme enhances the town centre. The site should, therefore, be incorporated within the Town Centre boundary defined as Appendix A. We provide further comment on the allocation of the</p>	<p>BHS/16 is seen as a site outside the town centre, there are no links across to the centre at the current time. The site is likely to be residential led and not a primary or secondary shopping area. The maps referred to show the primary shopping area and the primary and secondary shopping frontages in the retail area in Kidderminster.</p> <p>The comment relating to bullet point number 5 The proposals for alternative town centre uses will, where appropriate be supported if there is no significant impact on the vitality and viability of the existing centre. It is considered that this does not introduce a hierarchy of town centre uses.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>site and our response to Policy 30 – Kidderminster Town Allocations.</p> <p>We consider bullet point 5 of policy 10B is not NPPF compliant as it effectively seeks to introduce a hierarchy of town centre uses where residential and recreational uses are considered secondary to other town centre uses. Section 2 of the NPPF does not support this. This test should be removed from the Policy.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPP02633</a>	Policy 10B	Support	<p>We support the following:</p> <p><b>Policy 10B Town Centre Development.</b></p>	Support for Policy 10B is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP04854</a>	Policy 10B	Support	Support Policy 10B.	Support for Policy 10B is noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP0847</a>	Policy 10B	Support	Support for Policy 10B.	Support for Policy 10B is noted.
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">LPP01039</a>	Policy 10D	Comment	It may be beneficial to specify the types of tourist developments that are (or are not) desired or appropriate	Any proposal for tourist development would be determined on its merits and therefore a list of desired or not types of tourism would not be considered to be appropriate.
West Midland Safari Park	<a href="#">LPP01327</a>	Policy 10D	Comment	<p>Generally supportive of this policy, recognising as the supporting text does the regional significance of West Midlands Safari Park as a tourist attraction.</p> <p>We object to the Policy as presently drafted. The</p>	Wording of the policy has been amended.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>third bullet point gives the Council an opportunity to request off- site improvements and or contributions towards transport infrastructure. The policy and/or the supporting text should be amended to more closely reflect paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework so that it is made clear that such provision or such contributions will only be sought where the residual cumulative impact of developments are severe, and where it is practical and viable so to do. The amendments should be as Policy 6C.</p>	
<p>Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy &amp; Performance</p>	<p><a href="#">LPP01221</a></p>	<p>Policy 10D</p>	<p>Comment</p>	<p>WCC support the approach to tourism outlined in policy 10D.</p> <p>However, we feel that there is opportunity through the local plan review process to develop a revised and improved approach to car parking in the tourist towns of Bewdley and Stourport, where traffic congestion and lack of car parking are perceived to be limiting factors for the growth of the tourist industry, deter visitors and contribute to poor air quality in the towns, including within the AQMA.</p> <p>Our proposal is that the car parks are comprehensively reviewed and that new locations are developed to reflect the predominant flows of the traffic and prevent it having to cross the towns, reducing traffic congestion and also providing more</p>	<p>Agree that a comprehensive review of parking in Stourport on Severn and Bewdley would be welcomed.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				flexible car parking spaces. This is discussed in more detail in the attached document (Car Parking Review Bewdley and Stourport) and we welcome the opportunity to discuss these proposals in more detail with WFDC as the review of the local plan develops.	
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01370</a>	Policy 10D	Comment	In the third bullet point, the final word should be "centres" rather than "centre".	The amendment has been made.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01529</a>	Policy 10D	Comment	No comments.	Noted.
Ramblers Association	<a href="#">LPP04137</a>	Sustainable Tourism	Comment	Walking and cycling make significant contributions to the economy of rural areas, supporting local pubs, restaurants, accommodation and visitor attractions. Encouraging walking and cycling are very effective ways to improve the rural economy without making great demands on the environment or requiring excessive investment. Improvements to the condition of the footpath network and in safe cycle routes and making people aware of what is on offer should be priorities for those involved in promoting tourism. An acknowledgement of this in the plan would be useful.	Agree that walking and cycling are very important. This area is also considered in the Health Chapter (9), Transport Chapter (13) and Tourism Chapter (23).
	<a href="#">LPP03689</a>	Policy 10D	Object	There appears to be many optimistic and unsupported statements relating to what will take	It is unknown what proposals for tourism the Local Authority may receive.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				place to support tourism. Tourism will be severely impacted if the Green Belt is impacted and traffic flows are congested. There does not appear to be any concrete proposals.	The Local Authority can support suitable tourism by adopting policy such as the sustainable tourism policy.
	<a href="#">LPPO3846</a>	Paragraph 10.1	Object	I object to the Council’s strategy for development. Proposed eastern bypass is completely at odds with these statements.	The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.
	<a href="#">LPPO4495</a>	10.2 Retail and Leisure car parking	Comment	Nationally all Supermarket/Leisure Centres etc should have secure safe multi story parking attached with easy access to the main building e.g. new Leisure Centre/Aldi car park. Multi car parks can be attractive and safe if planned correctly, we cannot afford to cover our land with tarmac and planners need to be innovative rather than having to build on priceless Green Belt land.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3848</a>	Paragraph 10.2	Object	I object to the Council’s strategy for development. Proposed eastern bypass is completely at odds with these statements.  It is completely unjustified to release a further 40Hectares of employment land when the Council cannot make the best use of existing land including that which lies vacant. There are unused units on	The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				Easter Park that have lain empty since their construction. Any new units will also lay empty.	The ELR review findings were that additional employment land is required within the District.  Eight of the nine units on Easter Park are occupied.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01366</a>	Paragraph 10.3	Comment	In the second sentence, "initiative" should be "initiatives".	The word has been amended.
	<a href="#">LPP03861</a>	Paragraph 10.4	Object	Object to the Council's strategy for development. Unjustified to release a further 40Hectares of employment land when the existing land lies vacant. Unused units on Easter Park that have been empty since construction. Any new units will also lay empty.	There are nine units at Easter Park, eight of these are occupied.  The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.
Summerfield Against Land Transformation	<a href="#">LPP01614</a>	10.5 Employment	Comment	Low unemployment is welcomed — a low qualification workforce together with low wage and lower skill jobs is a concern. We endorse and encourage the Plan's partnership working initiatives with the Safari Park and the SVR in terms economic growth, employment and the capacity for	Employment land requirement is based on the findings of the 2016 Employment Land Review (ELR) which in 2018 is being updated. The housing numbers are based on the findings of the updated Objectively Assessed Housing Need OAHN 2018.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>cooperation in the provision of a rail transport infrastructure.</p> <p>We believe strongly that the Council should have an economic development led strategy to stem job losses and encourage SMEs to stimulate the local economy.</p> <p>We would encourage the Council to give a higher priority to stimulating the local economy (push strategy) and a more balanced approach to housing (pull strategy).</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO3862</a>	Paragraph 10.5	Object	I object to the Council's strategy for development. If the economy is successful there is no justification to enlarge it by unsustainable housing and employment land on the Green Belt.	The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.
	<a href="#">LPPO3688</a>	10.6	Object	There is no evidence to suggest that in migration of residents will be employed in Kidderminster. More likely is that they will commute to Birmingham and beyond.	By allocating additional land for employment uses the Council aim that as many people as possible will live and work within Wyre Forest District.
	<a href="#">LPPO3866</a>	Paragraph 10.6	Object	I object to the Council's strategy for development. Paving over fields will do little to address the perceived 'challenges', instead make them worse. The Council need to make best use of existing infrastructure before trying to enlarge.	The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					Sustainability Appraisal.  The Local Authority recognises that additional infrastructure will be required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3868</a>	Paragraph 10.7	Object	I object to the Council’s strategy for development. Paving over fields will do little to address the perceived ‘challenges’, instead make them worse. The Council need to make best use of existing infrastructure before trying to enlarge.	The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.  The Local Authority recognises that additional infrastructure will be required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3869</a>	Paragraph 10.8	Object	I object to the Council’s strategy for development. Paving over fields will do little to address the perceived ‘challenges’, instead make them worse. The Council need to make best use of existing infrastructure before trying to enlarge.	The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.  The Local Authority recognises that additional infrastructure will be required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3870</a>	Paragraph 10.9	Object	I object to the Council’s strategy and thinking for development. Paving over the fields will do little to address the perceived ‘challenges’, but instead	The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				make them worse. The Council need to demonstrate that it has made best use of existing infrastructure and that it is contributing to society before trying to enlarge. There is no present confidence in the proposals.	Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.  The Local Authority recognises that additional infrastructure will be required.
	<a href="#">LPPO5072</a>	10.10	Comment	The sentiment shown for developing the town centres, (Kidderminster, Bewdley & Stourport) presumes that the Civic Authorities are in a position of ownership, to be able to progress any development proposals or ideas. This is all very plausible but I would suggest that very little, if any, of the town centres are actually owned by the Civic Authorities. So from the very beginning any such ownership rights will prove to be expensive to the civic purse and precious little will be shown for the move to improve the town centres.	The Local Authority does not consider that the Civic Authorities own or would be progressing development. It is considered that developers would be progressing development facilitated by policy.
	<a href="#">LPPO5091</a>	10.10	Comment	The Council has made a number of attempts to attract more retailers to Kidderminster over the last few years, with limited success. It is clear that it is becoming more difficult for high street retailers to compete with internet services in all but a few markets, but there is no recognition of this in the Plan. The trend nationwide is for a decline in the number of banks, building societies, estate agents etc. which make up many of the businesses in town centres. Kidderminster town centre has at least 40	Agree that retail trends have changed and that regeneration is needed in Kidderminster.  The Local Authority has considered alternative uses to retail in the town centre to enhance vitality. This is found in Policy 10B and Policy 22A which consider alternative uses in the town centres. Policy 22A - In secondary shopping areas, support

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				large shops and office blocks that stand empty, some for well over a decade. The town centre is in urgent need of regeneration; I believe that Compulsory Purchase Orders should be made on some of the larger shops that stand no chance of ever being filled due to their size. Planning needs to accept that the amount of shop frontage in Kidderminster is in excess of need and the area associated with retail and related businesses in Kidderminster town centre be downsized to reflect likely future demand, and areas surplus to retail, such as Worcester Street, converted to apartments with some mixed use.	will be given for change of use of retail units to alternative uses such as leisure, recreation, employment and residential.
	<a href="#">LPP04774</a>	10.10	Comment	<p>Outdoor lifestyle of street restaurants, coffee shops and residential living if embraced into the council's plans would bring Kidderminster into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Other areas appear able to accommodate living and shopping /working environments within their town centres making them vibrant and used.</p> <p>It is nice to see the new riverside walk development thriving, hopefully it will continue, as it is evident that the population enjoy eating outside. The council should be looking to the town centre area initially encouraging companies and people to use the area, even reducing car park prices to encourage footfall or run a good local bus service well into the evening. The council need to work</p>	<p>The Local Authority has considered alternative uses to retail in town centres to enhance vitality and viability.</p> <p>Policy 10B and Policy 22A consider alternative uses in town centres. Policy 22A - In secondary shopping areas, support will be given for change of use of retail units to alternative uses such as leisure, recreation and residential.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				with property owners to re-designate their empty shops into residential for this purpose of encouraging people to live in town.	
	<a href="#">LPP03871</a>	Paragraph 10.10	Support	I support the paragraphs and statements therein for 10.10.	Support for paragraph 10.10 is noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01367</a>	Paragraph 10.17	Comment	In the second sentence, it should be "The District's settlement hierarchy of towns is..." rather than "are".	The sentence has been amended.
	<a href="#">LPP03873</a>	Paragraph 10.11	Object	I object to the Council's strategy and thinking for development. There is no evidence that the proposals have business cases that are economically viable with respect the demand analysis.	The Local Authority has evolved their strategy for development based on evidence. This includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) both in 2016 and updated in 2018 and supported by the Sustainability Appraisal.
	<a href="#">LPP04728</a>	10.15	Comment	Good to see that there is enough space in the town centres for the area's retail needs but cannot see any direct reference to using the disused factory and office space for housing needs. Is this something that is being considered?	The Local Authority has considered alternative uses to retail in the town centre to enhance vitality and viability.  Policy 10B and Policy 22A consider alternative uses in town centres. Policy 22A - In secondary shopping areas, support will be given for change of use of retail units to alternative uses such as leisure, recreation

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					and residential
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01368</a>	Paragraph 10.17	Comment	In the second sentence, the apostrophe in "town's" should be deleted.	This has been amended.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01369</a>	Paragraph 10.18	Comment	In the third sentence, the extra comma should be deleted. Also in this sentence, "as well" should be "as well as".	The amendments have been made.
Historic England	<a href="#">LPP01272</a>	Sustainable Tourism	Comment	We would recommend including a paragraph on heritage tourism and recognising the economic benefits of the historic environment. A clause could also usefully be included within Policy 10D.	Some of the wording in Policy 10D and the reasoned justification has been amended.
	<a href="#">LPP04758</a>	10.18	Comment	<b>Objective: The protection of those sites important to tourism:</b> It has to be recognised that the Severn Valley (including Bewdley town centre and some selected parts of Stourport), the Severn Valley Railway and the West Midlands Safari Park are essential to the local economy and require sensitive protection. There are other smaller sites throughout the District but, in a situation where vast additional housing and employment infrastructure requirements appear to have been identified as essential (notwithstanding the importance of tourism), all areas should be subject	The Local Authority considers all of the District when identifying possible sites for development.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				to scrutiny.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3874</a>	Paragraph 10.18	Object	I object to the Council's strategy and thinking for development. The Council states that there is a large contribution to the local economy brought by tourism. This will be harmed by over development of the small towns over their natural size bringing down the environment and pleasant setting. Tourists will not want to travel through acres of urbanised jungle to access sole-less town centre. Tourism will be damaged along with the economy by paving over the existing Green Belt.	The Local Authority seeks to protect and enhance tourism within the District however additional development is required based on evidence which includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) 2016, updated 2018 and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) studies 2016, updated 2018.
	<a href="#">LPPO615</a>	10.18	Support	Support for paragraph 10.18.	Support for 10.18 is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3875</a>	Paragraph 10.19	Object	I object to the Council's strategy and thinking for development. The Council states that there is a large contribution to the local economy brought by tourism. This will be harmed by over development of the small towns over their natural size bringing down the environment and pleasant setting. Tourists will not want to travel through acres of urbanised jungle to access sole-less town centre. Tourism will be damaged along with the economy by paving over the existing Green Belt.	The Local Authority seeks to protect and enhance tourism within the District however additional development is required based on evidence which includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) 2016, updated 2018 and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) studies 2016, updated 2018.
	<a href="#">LPPO598</a>	10.20	Comment	Given the importance of tourism to the local economy, any developments that would reduce the greenfield footpaths or destroy countryside views	The Local Authority agrees that tourism is important to the local economy and seek to protect and enhance tourism within the District. A balance needs to be made as additional development is required based

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>should be resisted.</p> <p>The green setting of Bewdley west and north of the river giving a gradual transition from town to field to forest should be preserved as these views are valued by passengers on the SVR and tourists taking circular walks from the town.</p>	<p>on evidence including an Employment Land Review (ELR) 2016, updated 2018 and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) studies in 2016 and updated in 2018. The Local Authority will try to ensure that development has minimal impact on tourism.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3876</a>	Paragraph 10.20	Object	<p>I object to the Council's strategy and thinking for development. The Council states that there is a large contribution to the local economy brought by tourism. This will be harmed by over development of the small towns over their natural size bringing down the environment and pleasant setting. Tourists will not want to travel through acres of urbanised jungle to access sole-less town centre. Tourism will be damaged along with the economy by paving over the existing Green Belt.</p>	<p>The Local Authority seeks to protect and enhance tourism within the District however additional development is required based on evidence which includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) 2016, updated 2018 and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) studies 2016, updated 2018.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3877</a>	Paragraph 10.21	Object	<p>I object to the Council's strategy and thinking for development. The Council states that there is a large contribution to the local economy brought by tourism. This will be harmed by over development of the small towns over their natural size bringing down the environment and pleasant setting. Tourists will not want to travel through acres of urbanised jungle to access sole-less town centre. Tourism will be damaged along with the economy by paving over the existing Green Belt.</p>	<p>The Local Authority seeks to protect and enhance tourism within the District however additional development is required based on evidence which includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) 2016, updated 2018 and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) studies 2016, updated 2018.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP03878</a>	Paragraph 10.22	Object	I object to the Council's strategy and thinking for development. The Council states that there is a large contribution to the local economy brought by tourism. This will be harmed by over development of the small towns over their natural size bringing down the environment and pleasant setting. Tourists will not want to travel through acres of urbanised jungle to access sole-less town centre. Tourism will be damaged along with the economy by paving over the existing Green Belt.	The Local Authority seeks to protect and enhance tourism within the District however additional development is required based on evidence which includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) 2016, updated 2018 and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) studies 2016, updated 2018.
	<a href="#">LPP04729</a>	10.23	Comment	The focus on tourism within this section relates to many attractions which are on the western side of the district. 10.23 notes that most are day trippers and I suspect that most come from the larger conurbation areas to the east. This makes the idea of building up to and beyond the A456 which is already a bottleneck across the town seems inconsistent with the words in this section.	Comments are noted.
	<a href="#">LPP03879</a>	Paragraph 10.23	Object	I object to the Council's strategy and thinking for development. The Council states that there is a large contribution to the local economy brought by tourism. This will be harmed by over development of the small towns over their natural size bringing down the environment and pleasant setting. Tourists will not want to travel through acres of urbanised jungle to access sole-less town centre. Tourism will be damaged along with the economy by paving over the existing Green Belt.	The Local Authority seeks to protect and enhance tourism within the District however additional development is required based on evidence which includes an Employment Land Review (ELR) 2016, updated 2018 and Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAHN) studies 2016, updated 2018.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP0616</a>	10.23	Support	Support for paragraph 10.23.	Support for paragraph 10.23 is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01977</a>	Economy	Comment	Town needs more investment in good quality well paid jobs not low pay. Better good quality business should be encouraged to come to Kidderminster and area before building on green fields.	Agree that investment to bring good quality well paid jobs is to be encouraged.
	<a href="#">LPP04587</a>	Section 10	Comment	<p><b>Employment Opportunities:</b> There is no evidence that the suggested enhanced employment opportunities will 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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Agree that changes in retail patterns have had a detrimental effect on Kidderminster town centre. The Local Authority has considered alternative uses to retail in the town centre to enhance vitality.</p> <p>Policy 10B and Policy 22A consider alternative uses in the town centres. Policy 22A - In secondary shopping areas, support will be given for change of use of retail units to alternative uses such as leisure, recreation, employment and residential.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>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>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.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO4864</a>	Section 10	Comment	<p>With the development of Weavers Wharf many of the major high street stores relocated to this area with the consequence being that the shopping outside Weavers Wharf and Vicar Street has become non viable. The town centre is described in the review as being "attractive and accessible" which may have some merit for Weavers Wharf and Vicar Street but move away from this area all that can be seen are empty buildings and shops. Over the years I have lived in Kidderminster there have been numerous proposals for development and improvement in Kidderminster Centre reported in the local press with artists impressions however apart from Weavers Wharf none of these</p>	<p>Agree that changes in retail patterns have had a detrimental effect on Kidderminster town centre. The Local Authority has considered alternative uses to retail in Kidderminster town centre to enhance vitality and viability.</p> <p>Policy 10B and Policy 22A consider alternative uses in the town centre. Policy 22A - In secondary shopping areas, support will be given for change of use of retail units to alternative uses such as leisure, recreation and residential</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 10: A GOOD PLACE TO DO BUSINESS**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				developments have ever been realised. Unless something is done in the short term I see no reason why anyone would want to live or set up business in Kidderminster.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3383</a>	Option A	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggested growth in employment opportunities is not supported by current patterns.</li> </ul>	Wyre Forest District Council commissioned an Employment Land Review (ELR) in 2016 to assess economic development needs across the District. The findings were that up to 40 hectares of employment land was required within the District. In 2018 an update to the ELR was commissioned to ensure that the requirement for employment land is up to date.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<u>LPP01222</u>	11.2	Comment	<p>The second sentence of para 11.2 states that, "The environment of Wyre Forest District is made unique by the valleys of the River Severn and River Stour and by the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal which all run through the District and help to shape the landscape". The Wyre Forest itself should be included as a major and distinctive landscape asset comparable to the rivers in terms of both character and significance within planning policy. It is the largest contiguous area of Ancient Woodland in England (source: Wyre Forest Landscape Partnership). The District shares approximately half of Wyre and its satellite woodlands with Shropshire, which is a significant area of landscape. Not least, the forest is a major Green Infrastructure hub in the district, which should be a material consideration in high quality design and reinforcing local distinctiveness.</p> <p>The Wyre Forest Landscape Partnership has developed a suite of documents that sets out the strategic importance of the forest and its setting. This includes action areas for biodiversity, landscape, historic environment, forestry, access and education, economy and tourism, which should inform design opportunities, where appropriate, to deliver better connectivity to the forest.</p>	<p>Comments on paragraph 11.2 noted.</p> <p>Agreed amend paragraph 11.2 second and third sentences to read:</p> <p>"The environment of Wyre Forest District is made unique by the valleys of the River Severn and River Stour and by the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal which all run through the District and help to shape the landscape. A major and distinctive landscape asset is the Wyre Forest itself, comparable to the rivers in terms of both character and significance within planning policy and being the largest contiguous area of Ancient Woodland in England (source: Wyre Forest Landscape Partnership)."</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP04757</a>	11.4	Comment	<p><b><u>Objective: The provision of a comprehensive network of green spaces and corridors to help support a range of biodiversity.</u></b></p> <p>Green Belt (an important contributor in support of biodiversity) should be protected from development.</p> <p>Little evidence of “a network of green spaces and corridors” within urban Kidderminster. Objective unachievable without wholesale demolitions thus even more important remaining green space protected from creeping urban sprawl.</p> <p>Designated nature reserves should remain protected.</p>	Comments on paragraph 11.4 noted.
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPP01384</a>	Policy 11A	Comment	<p>Whilst Gladman recognise the importance of high quality design, planning policies should not be overly prescriptive and need flexibility in order for schemes to respond to site specifics and the character of the local area. There is not a 'one size fits all' solution in relation to design. Para.59 NPPF - “Design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more</p>	<p>Comment on Policy 11 A noted.</p> <p>The Council's Adopted Design Quality SPD provides general design guidance in line with the Framework, it does not prescribe specific designs or details on proposed developments.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				generally." SPDs should avoid prescriptive design requirements that place an undue financial burden on development schemes.	
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<u>LPPO1371</u>	Policy 11A	Comment	Part C should be changed to become "...design processes set out within the latest <u>adopted</u> Design SPD ( <del>June 2015</del> ) and <u>adopted later revisions</u> ".	Comment on Policy 11 A noted.  Amend Policy 11 A C to read: "...design processes set out within the latest <u>adopted</u> Design SPD"
Kidderminster Harriers Football Club	<u>LPPO952</u>	Policy 11A	Comment	Add to paragraph A. <u>New developments will need to be accessible for all users, including those with disabilities.</u>	Comment on paragraph 11 A noted.  POLICY 9 Health and Well Being to have a further sentence added as follows: "New developments will need to be accessible for all users, including those with disabilities." Not all development affecting heritage assets can be made accessible for all.
	<u>LPPO2193</u>	Policy 11A	Comment	There needs to be an improved definition of high quality design. Whilst the idea of high quality is exemplary, is this achievable in large scale affordable developments where cost is key?  With the high land values, density is often a prime factor resulting in cramped housing with a 'toy town' appearance.  Environmentally sustainable systems should be built within dwellings from the outset i.e. solar panels – to avoid 'messy' piecemeal add-ons.	Comment on Policy 11 A noted.  The Council's Adopted Design Guidance SPD (2015) sets out to guide development by explaining how developers can secure high quality design whilst at the same time both creating and reinforcing local distinctiveness and protecting & establishing landscape character.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				Large sites could accommodate areas for solar panels to support energy conservation and sustainability.	
Place Partnership Ltd	<u>LPPO1091</u>	11.12	Comment	The recognition that crime and the fear of crime is often a big issue within local communities and can affect their well-being is welcomed and supported by WP, WMP and HWFRS. This provides the necessary underpinning for requesting the design and infrastructure measures needed to mitigate these problems in new development. This in turn will ensure the delivery of the objectives on this issue set out by paragraphs 58 and 69 of the NPPF.	Comments on Paragraph 11.12 noted.
North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership	<u>LPPO27</u>	11.13	Comment	Point of accuracy - Wyre Forest Community Safety Partnership no longer exists. It was merged in 2011 with Bromsgrove and Redditch to form the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership. WFDC along with the other councils leads on the co-ordination of the partnership via the Community Safety Team.	Comment on paragraph 11.13 noted.  Paragraph 11.13 to be amended to read:  "The issue of crime and community safety is dealt with at a local level by the North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership, which is the Crime and Disorder Partnership that operates across Wyre Forest District, Bromsgrove District and Redditch Borough Councils. WFDC along with the other councils leads on the co-ordination of the Partnership via the Community Safety Team. The Partnership brings together a variety of stakeholders who share the vision "Wyre Forest - an even safer place to live, work, visit or do business in".

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<u>LPP04059</u>	Policy 11B	Comment	Since the war and in particular in the 1960's 70's 80's Bewdley has greatly expanded and accommodated a lot of additional and substantial housing development on greenfield land totally altering the size character and layout of the town and increasing pressures on local services/transport provision etc. The same applies in many ways to Stourport	Comment on Policy 11 B noted.
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	<u>LPP01209</u>	Policy 11B	Comment	Under A, would it be appropriate to add "both designated and undesignated heritage assets"?	Comment noted and Policy 11 B A to be amended to read:  "Development proposals should protect, conserve and enhance both designated and undesignated heritage assets, including....."
	<u>LPP04029</u>	Policy 11B	Comment	Public parks are a real asset that are well-used by local residents and should continue to be maintained and improved. However, it's disheartening to see litter and graffiti appearing time after time (at Brinton Park specifically) – the council is spending money cleaning it up only for it to reappear again. This money could be put to better use. Antisocial behaviour in general is affecting local residents and dog walkers, with little being done to stop the cycle.	Comments on Policy 11B B iii. noted.  Comments on litter, graffiti and anti-social behaviour noted. The Council has legislative powers to tackle these issues, however the purpose of this plan is to guide development whereas these comments relate to existing issues within public parks.
	<u>LPP04260</u>	Policy 11B	Comment	You will spoil a very nice rural community, as we do have lots of visitors and walkers.	Comments on Policy 11 B noted.  The comments do not specify which part of the rural community will be "spoilt" nor how

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					implementation of Policy 11 B will affect visitors and walkers.
Bewdley Civic Society	<u>LPP0853</u>	Policy 11B	Comment	Policy <b>11B historic environment</b> . Support but object in part (see policy 26A): It is illogical that converted barns (non-designated assets) cannot be subsequently extended when any other accommodation can, including listed buildings, houses in conservation areas etc. The impact of this highly untenable, harsh and prescriptive policy not to allow any extensions fails to follow NPPF advice, allow for improvements to the accommodation or to take account of changing family circumstances. All extensions should be considered on their merits within the historic qualities/parameters of original property i.e. under policy 26A.	Support for Policy 11B noted; objections in part to Policy 26A noted.
Gladman Developments Limited	<u>LPP01385</u>	Policy 11B	Comment	Gladman note the inclusion of Policy 11B and Policy 26, which together provide policies relating to the historic environment. These policies must reflect guidance in NPPF paras. 126-141. paras. 133-134 sets out need to assess significance of designated heritage assets. Where there is less than substantial harm, this should be weighed against public benefits of proposal. Where there is deemed to be substantial harm, then the proposal would need to achieve substantial public benefits to outweigh that harm. Non-designated assets - policy should reflect para 135 - a balanced	Comment on Policy 11 B noted.  The comments on reference to NPPF guidance relate to Policy 26. It is not the function of Local Plan Policies to repeat sections of the NPPF nor to reference specific paragraphs within the Framework. Reference to the Framework is sufficient to steer developers to the most up-to-date version in force at the time.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				judgement should be reached having regard to the scale of any harm and the significance of the heritage asset. In addition, any policy requirements for landscape protection should be fully justified as part of the council's proportionate evidence base and balanced criteria based policies drafted.	
Canal & River Trust	<u>LPP01011</u>	Policy 11B	Comment	Canal corridor is designated a Conservation Area and we welcome references for development to build on historic significance whilst protecting their character and historic integrity. Policy 11B could include specific reference to Stourport Basin.	Comments on Policy 11 B noted.  Policy 11B B vii. refers to "The historic inland port of Stourport-on-Severn" which is the basins.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<u>LPP01484</u>	Archaeological Issues	Comment	Full archaeological surveys should be undertaken on Green Belt and greenfield land under consideration for development. For example, Spennells Fields have historical drainage ditches in this area of archaeological importance that should be protected and enhanced.	Comment on archaeological issues noted.  The evidence base for the historic environment identifies those sites with known archaeological remains and other heritage assets recorded on the Worcestershire Historic Environment Record.  On sites where there is no known archaeology it is acknowledged that there remains the potential for archaeological interest which may be discovered, recorded and submitted to inform the decision-making process prior to determination of planning applications.
Taylor Wimpey	<u>LPP01530</u>	Policy 11B	Comment	No comments.	The respondent's "No comments" on Policy 11 B

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
West Midlands					is noted.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<u>LPP01531</u>	Policy 11C	Comment	No comments.	The respondent's "no comments" on Policy 11 C is noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<u>LPP01223</u>	Policy 11C	Comment	Reference to the Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Guidance 2012 should be added to the second paragraph, such that it becomes "The Worcestershire County Council Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Guidance (2012) and Historic Landscape Characterisation will be... "	Comment on Policy 11 C noted.  Paragraph two to be amended to read:  "The Worcestershire County Council Landscape Character Assessment Supplementary Guidance (2012 or as later amended) and Historic Landscape Characterisation will be... "
	<u>LPP04257</u>	11.29	Comment	You should take into consideration the amount of wildlife that would be disturbed.	Comments on paragraph 11.29 noted.  Policy 11D details the criteria used to assess proposals for development which could impact on wildlife.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<u>LPP01224</u>	11.29	Comment	Explicit reference should be made to the LCA Supplementary Guidance in paragraph 11.29. It is a document designed to inform planning and land management, and is a tool for planners, designers and local communities. The Supplementary Guidance is available here: <a href="http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/file/4788/landscape_character_assessment_supplementary_guidance">http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/file/4788/landscape_character_assessment_supplementary_guidance</a>	Comment on paragraph 11.29 noted.  The reference to the LCA is included in paragraph 128.  Paragraph 11.28 to be amended as follows:  "Worcestershire County Council has undertaken a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) covering the rural areas of the county. The LCA is a tool for identifying those features that give a

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					<p>locality its sense of place, and is used to sub-divide the landscape into areas of similar character, classified as Landscape Types (7). The LCA Supplementary Guidance is a document designed to inform planning and land management, and is a tool for planners, designers and local communities.(8)</p> <p>Footnote: (8)</p> <p><a href="http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/file/4788/landscape_character_assessment_supplementary_guidance">http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/file/4788/landscape_character_assessment_supplementary_guidance</a></p>
Wyre Forest Green Party	<u>LPPO1401</u>	Flooding	Comment	<p>We are 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>Comments on flooding noted.</p> <p>Flood Risk Management is the subject of a separate policy: Policy 15C and sustainable drainage is the subject of Policy 15D.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01227</a>	Policy 11E	Comment	The first two sentences of part A do not seem to be policy, and are more suited to the reasoned justification. A policy should not need to say that proposals should comply with its own contents or other policies.	Comments on Policy 11 E part A noted.  Policy 11 E part A to be amended to read:  "All proposals for development in or adjacent to the District's rivers and/or within an area at risk of flooding must also conform with WFDC Policy 15C"
Historic England	<a href="#">LPP01276</a>	Policy 11E	Comment	Policy 11E - is the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal a Canal Conservation Area - if so it would be worth including this within the policy and a reasoned justification about this and how this will impact future development proposals. Under the rivers section we would recommend - 'Development which preserves <u>and enhances</u> the historic riverside character of Bewdley will be encouraged'.	Comments on Policy 11 E noted.  Amend title of Policy 11 E B to read: "Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area"  Amend final paragraph of Policy 11 E A to read:  "Development which preserves and enhances the historic riverside character of Bewdley will be encouraged"  Reasoned justification  Add paragraph 11.36 to read:  "Proposals for development within or adjacent to the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal Conservation Area should accord with the most up-to-date Conservation Area Character Appraisal and management plan".

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<u>LPP01535</u>	Policy 11E	Comment	No comments.	The respondent's "no comments" on Policy 11 E is noted.
Environment Agency	<u>LPP01063</u>	Policy 11E	Comment	<p>Assume that first sentence should refer to Policy 15 Water Management. These policies should be joined up so that any waterway regeneration includes enhancement in terms of wider water management.</p> <p>Suggest policy wording is changed to read 'Rivers are to be enhanced in accordance with Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and <u>Water Management Policies</u></p>	<p>Comments on Policy 11 E noted.</p> <p>Policy 11 E part A first paragraph to be amended to read:</p> <p>"All proposals for development in or adjacent to the District's rivers and/or within an area at risk of flooding must also conform with WFDC Policy 15C"</p> <p>Policy 11 E part A second paragraph to read:</p> <p>"Rivers are to be enhanced in accordance with Green Infrastructure, Biodiversity and Water Management Policies"</p>
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<u>LPP01372</u>	11.33	Comment	This sentence should be amended as follows: "Two of the District's three main waterways: (the River Stour and the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal) pass..."	<p>Comment on paragraph 11.33 noted.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.33 to be amended to read:</p> <p>"Two of the District's three main waterways (the River Stour and the Staffordshire and Worcestershire Canal) pass through Kidderminster and Stourport-on-Severn, whilst the principal river, the Severn, passes through both Stourport-on-Severn and Bewdley."</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Wyre Forest Green Party	<u>LPP01475</u>	Recreation /Landscape /Visual Amenity	Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 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.</li> <li>2. 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-being and economic opportunity. The <b>‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Assessment Report’</b> (2013), recognised that landscape provides a shared resource as a ‘public good’ – clearly seen by the current use of Spennells’ by residents. This Report also emphasised the need to improve the quantity and quality of publicly accessible open spaces, however this is not in the Local Plan.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Policy 9 Health and Well Being Parts 6, 9 and 10 and Paragraph 14.1 Strategic Green Infrastructure set out the Council's commitment to deliver a comprehensive network of green spaces and corridors across the District to help promote active lifestyles within attractive and safe public spaces.</p>
	<u>LPP04740</u>	Section 11	Comment	<b>Section 11 A Unique Place</b>	Comment on section 11 noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				Again it is not clear in some of the language used in this section whether reference to plans relates to this document or some other one. As an example within 11.5 there is a box in purple about responses to issues. It mentions options A and B which I assume relates to the options in this document but I'm not sure how or why.	Sections 1.11 to 1.13 explain the plan making process and explain how the "Issues and Options" consultation conducted in 2015 extensively informed the prepared of the Preferred Options document.
	<u>LPPO3883</u>	11.10	Object	The existing assets will become dwarfed by overly development of green field sites causing an imbalance by trying to artificially enlarge a town beyond its natural size. I therefore object.	Objection noted.  The evidence base has identified those development sites which contain or are adjacent to heritage assets. Development proposals which impact on heritage assets must satisfy Policy 26 - Safeguarding the Historic Environment. Policy 26 section A considers impacts on setting.
	<u>LPPO3884</u>	11.11	Object	The existing assets will become dwarfed by overly development of green field sites causing an imbalance by trying to artificially enlarge a town beyond its natural size. I therefore object.	Objection noted.  The evidence base has identified those development sites which contain or are adjacent to heritage assets. The justification in Paragraph 11.11 refers to the successful incorporation of heritage assets into development. Policy 26 section A allows decision makers to consider the impacts of development on the setting of these assets.
	<u>LPPO3691</u>	11.12	Object	11.12. 11.13 – Crime	Objection noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>- It is inevitable that crime and antisocial behaviour will increase in creation of such a huge Housing estate under Option A. New developments will have the opposite effect on reduction of crime. Design cannot prevent this.</p> <p>- This is due to crowding together, lack of open space, lack of good schooling. Neighbourhood disputes.</p> <p>This section does not go into enough detail as to the steps taken to prevent anti-social behaviour and petty crime.</p>	<p>The NPPF at paragraph 58 requires local planning authorities to: <i>"create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion"</i>.</p> <p>The Design Guidance SPD adopted June 2015 seeks to secure high quality development to create safe and accessible development, with sections on Landscape Quality in Residential Developments and Design of Space for Play.</p> <p>North Worcestershire Community Safety Partnership (which includes West Mercia Police) is invited to comment on all major developments.</p>
	<p><u>LPPO3880</u></p>	<p>11.7</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>I object to the Council's strategy and thinking for development. The statements portray an idealised story but provide no evidence of attainment of high quality design or its definition and how it will be brought into practise. Past examples of the Council's involvement have brought very poor design and development and utilised land inefficiently. There is no confidence that this will not be repeated, therefore I object to the development proposals.</p>	<p>Objections noted, however the Design Guidance SPD adopted June 2015 is intended to guide planning decisions relating to development within the District as outlined in Policy 11A.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<u>LPPO3881</u>	11.8	Object	The Council needs to improve the existing development to demonstrate efficient land use before attempting to bring Green Belt into inefficient development. I therefore object. The Council is incapable of undertaking good quality development. I therefore object.	Objection to paragraph 11.8 noted.  The Design Guidance SPD adopted June 2015 underlies the Council's commitment to improve the quality of development within the area. Application of this guidance will contribute to good quality development.
	<u>LPPO3882</u>	11.9	Object	The Council needs to improve the existing development to demonstrate efficient land use before attempting to bring Green Belt into inefficient development. I therefore object. The Council is incapable of undertaking good quality development. I therefore object.	Objection to paragraph 11.8 noted.  The Design Guidance SPD adopted June 2015 underlies the Council's commitment to improve the quality of development within the area. Application of this guidance will contribute to good quality development.
	<u>LPPO3885</u>	Policy 11B.A	Object	Policy 11B.A will not be achievable with large scale housing development and over population of a naturally small market town of Kidderminster. Assets will become dwarfed and insignificant with their setting spoilt by having to drive through miles of urbanisation of a large town. I therefore object.	Objection to Policy 11B.A noted.  Enlargement of the town of Kidderminster may affect the wider context of heritage assets within the historic core of the original market town irrespective of any inter-visibility.  Development which directly impacts on these assets on adjacent brownfield sites is supported where it can protect, conserve and enhance the industrial urban landscape and surviving heritage assets and settings.
	<u>LPPO3692</u>	Policy 11B	Object	Policy 11 B Historic environment	Objection to Policy 11 B noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Vii Note you refer to <i>The industrial urban landscape of the historic <u>market town</u> of Kidderminster</i></p> <p>Note that you refer to Kidderminster as a market town. Therefore why are you changing the uniqueness, distinctiveness by turning it into a commuter town?</p>	<p>To clarify: the paragraph quoted is Policy 11B B viii.</p> <p>Historically Kidderminster was a market town. It became industrialised in the 19th century. Policy 11 B seeks to protect, conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets, including their setting, in particular the industrial urban landscape of [the historic market town of] Kidderminster with its surviving heritage assets and their settings.</p> <p>The reference to Kidderminster being turned "into a commuter town" is opinion that is contrary to policy in this Local Plan which is to encourage economic development within the District.</p>
	<p><u>LPPO3886</u></p>	<p>11.15 - 11.25</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.</p>	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.
	<u>LPPO3888</u>	11.16	Object	Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.</p>
	<u>LPPO3889</u>	11.17	Object	Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.
	<u>LPPO3890</u>	11.18	Object	Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.</p>
	<u>LPPO3891</u>	11.19	Object	Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					<p>farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.</p>
	<u>LPPO3892</u>	11.20	Object	<p>Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.</p>	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.</p>
	<u>LPPO3893</u>	11.21	Object	<p>Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object</p>	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				to its further attempts of enlargement.	<p>distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.</p>
	<u>LPPO3894</u>	11.22	Object	<p>Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.</p>	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.</p>
	<u>LPPO3895</u>	11.23	Object	<p>Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future</p>	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.	<p>significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.</p>
	<u>LPPO3896</u>	11.24	Object	Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.	<p>Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.</p> <p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.</p>
	<u>LPPO3897</u>	11.25	Object	Environment of the area will be damaged by enlarging towns at expense of valuable green	Objection to paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				fields. I therefore object to the proposals. Council has idealised view of a developed future but not supported by evidence with a rundown town centre and inefficient use of land. I object to its further attempts of enlargement.	<p>Policy 11B to which paragraphs 11.15 to 11.25 refer seeks to protect conserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets including at 11B.B ii. the historic landscape including locally distinctive settlement patterns, field systems, woodlands and commons and historic farmsteads and smallholdings.</p> <p>Historic Landscape Characterisation studies produced for Worcestershire County Council provide an evidence base to inform assessments of the heritage value of historic landscapes subject to development proposals.</p>
	<u>LPPO2174</u>	East of Kidderminster Huncott area	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New development will not protect and enhance the unique character of the landscape.</li> <li>• It will overlook houses in adjacent streets.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection to development at the East of Kidderminster - Huncott Area is noted.</p> <p>New development must be sustainable if it is to accord with the National Planning Policy Framework. If this site is selected for inclusion within the Site Allocations for the pre-submission Local Plan, officers and members will have considered whether any adverse impacts of development would be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the benefits that development will bring.</p>
Gladman Developments Limited	<u>LPPO1386</u>	Policy 11C & 11D	Object	Policies 11C & 11D fail to reflect NPPF emphasis on natural environment. NPPF para.113 refers to need for criteria based policies in relation to proposals affecting protected wildlife or	Objection and comments are noted. Since the Preferred Options document was published the Government has revised its NPPF, which was published in July 2018. NPPF para 113 that is

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				geodiversity sites or landscape areas and any protection should be commensurate with their status. Current policy wording is not in accordance with NPPF.	referred to in this consultation response has been removed from the revised NPPF. Policy 11D has been updated to be compliant with the revised NPPF.
	<u>LPPO1721</u>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Threat to wildlife.</li> </ul>	Objection to proposed development site New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7 noted.  Comments on paragraph 11.29 noted.  Policy 11D details the criteria used to assess proposals for development which could impact on wildlife.
	<u>LPPO3898</u>	11.30	Object	What the Council believed should happen and what actually happens in practise are completely at odds when the Council is involved. There is no previous evidence that it can use land efficiently and sensitively with good design. I therefore object to its proposals.	Objection to Paragraph 11.30 noted.  The objection is based on the assumption that the Council will not be able to deliver the supplementary guidance on the landscape character of the Severn Valley nor designate the Severn Valley Railway as a Conservation Area, but there is no evidence submitted by the objector to support this assumption.
	<u>LPPO1822</u>	Burlish Crossing LI/5	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would lose the view from back garden.</li> <li>Wildlife would be affected.</li> </ul>	Objection to Burlish Site LI/5 noted.  The Options referred to in Policy 11 Summary of Issues and Options Responses are related to the Design and Local Distinctiveness section of the 2015 consultation document, and not the Preferred Options Consultation Document of

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					2017.
	<u>LPPO2204</u>	Option A - Spennells	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will destroy the environment.</li> <li>• Expansion on Green Belt is lazy and irresponsible - only done because it's cheaper and quicker.</li> <li>• Many brownfield sites are available that need renovation and could serve better locations for new houses.</li> <li>• Green Belt should only be used as last resort.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection to Option A noted.</p> <p>The Options referred to in Policy 11 Summary of Issues and Options Responses are related to the Design and Local Distinctiveness section of the 2015 consultation document, and not the Preferred Options Consultation Document of 2017.</p>
	<u>LPPO2207</u>	Option A - Spennells	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The countryside around Spennells is good for tourism and economy.</li> <li>• Loss of habitat.</li> <li>• The development would be an insult on nature and the local residents.</li> <li>• Many local residents use the surrounding country side for leisure purposes.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection to Option A noted.</p> <p>The Options referred to in Policy 11 Summary of Issues and Options Responses are related to the Design and Local Distinctiveness section of the 2015 consultation document, and not the Preferred Options Consultation Document of 2017.</p>
	<u>LPPO3227</u>	A Unique Place	Object	<p>The ecology and natural beauty of the whole Wyre Forest area will be severely compromised.</p> <p>The balance of nature is already precarious.</p> <p>The government's present housebuilding policies will damage our countryside forever.</p>	<p>Objection to Section 11 A Unique Place noted.</p> <p>The District has no option but to make provision for the construction of sustainable new housing developments within the Plan to accord with Government Policy. As part of the planning process the tests for sustainability consider the impacts on the natural environment.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Future generations will look back and weep at the decisions of today and the destruction caused through knee-jerk reaction to rampant immigration which has been enabled over the last 15 years.</p> <p>The intention to build more than 25,000 new homes this Parliament and up to 225,000 in the longer term demonstrates this.</p>	
	<u>LPPO3690</u>	Section 11	Object	<p>Statements are at complete odds to the proposals in Option A</p> <p>The fields are used by many for well being, cycling, walking, nature walks, education, and wildlife preservation.</p> <p>Option A is contradictory with your proposals under this section.</p> <p>Impacts of using Option A will be a less unique place, increased health and mental health problems, increase obesity and destruction of wildlife.</p>	<p>Objection to Section 11 noted.</p> <p>The Options referred to in Policy 11 Summary of Issues and Options Responses are related to the Design and Local Distinctiveness section of the 2015 consultation document, and not the Preferred Options Consultation Document of 2017.</p>
	<u>LPPO1707</u>	Plough Lane, Far Forest	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise increase.</li> <li>• New development will have a massive</li> </ul>	<p>Policy 11B B refers to support for development which protects, conserves and enhances the significance of heritage assets.</p> <p>Part ix. identifies these assets as including rural</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				affect on natural beauty.	<p>villages within the District, including their associated Conservation Areas and buildings, along with their settings and historic views to and from the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>This part of the policy is designed to set the bar in these environments to ensure that development protects, conserves and enhances them. Development which does not would thus not be supported.</p>
	<u>LPP01734</u>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	Objection to development site New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7 noted.
	<u>LPP01898</u>	Burlish Crossing (LI/5), Lickhill Rd North (LI/6/7), Steatite Way (MI/6)	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Burlish Top has historical and wildlife value.</li> <li>• Wyre Forest Gold Club, corner of Kingsway was subject to fly-tipping - do we know what has been dumped here?</li> <li>• A water table has been affected causing flooding in some adjacent properties.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection to Burlish Crossing (LI/5), Lickhill Rd North noted.</p> <p>The Options referred to in Policy 11 Summary of Issues and Options Responses are related to the Design and Local Distinctiveness section of the 2015 consultation document, and not the Preferred Options Consultation Document of 2017.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Historic England	<a href="#">LPP01273</a>	Policy 11A	Support	<b>We support Policy 11A</b>	Support for Policy 11A noted.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01532</a>	Policy 11A	Support	Aspirations are supported.	Support for Policy 11A noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP0848</a>	Policy 11A	Support	Support for Policy 11A.	Support for Policy 11A noted.
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">LPP01040</a>	Policy 11A	Support	We support this policy, and suggest that there should be a reference to ensuring diversity of design and appearance, especially in larger developments, to guard against copy/paste designs that deliver unattractive mass uniformity. Given the scale of the Eastern area defined as 'core sites', perhaps a small village/settlement approach to releasing and developing these areas might help to deliver distinctive and quality designs and attractive places to live?	Support for Policy 11A noted.  In respect of the comments: " <i>reference to ensuring diversity of design and appearance, especially in larger developments, to guard against copy/paste designs that deliver unattractive mass uniformity</i> ", which read as being related to housing, these are to be contained within a revised version of the Design Guidance SPD (in the section Design Principles for Residential Development - Larger Scale Developments 3.37 to 3.50).
	<a href="#">LPP02634</a>	Policy 11A	Support	We support the following: <b>Policy 11A Local distinctiveness.</b>	Support for Policy 11A noted.
	<a href="#">LPP04855</a>	Policy 11A	Support	Support Policy 11A.	Support for Policy 11 A noted.
	<a href="#">LPP0618</a>	11.8	Support	Support for paragraph 11.8.	Support for paragraph 11.8 noted.
	<a href="#">LPP04856</a>	Policy 11B	Support	Support Policy 11B.	Support for Policy 11 B noted.
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPP0830</a>	Policy 11B	Support	Policy 11B is to be supported, and in particular the importance of preserving Bewdley's setting, open spaces and views of the town.	Support for Policy 11 B noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Historic England	<a href="#">LPP01274</a>	Policy 11B	Support	We support Policy 11B for the Historic Environment and the accompanying reasoned justification text.	Support for Policy 11 B noted.
	<a href="#">LPP02635</a>	Policy 11B	Support	We support the following: <b>Policy 11B Historic Environment.</b>	Support for Policy 11 B noted.
Historic England	<a href="#">LPP01275</a>	Policy 11C	Support	We support Policy 11C and the reference to historic landscape character and the available evidence base.	Support for Policy 11 C noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP0854</a>	Policy 11C	Support	Support for Policy 11C.	Support for Policy 11C noted.
	<a href="#">LPP0619</a>	Policy 11C - B	Support	Support for Policy 11C bullet point B - Severn Valley Heritage Park.	Support for Policy 11 C Part B noted.
	<a href="#">LPP0600</a>	11.26	Support	Landscape around Bewdley contributes much to its historic setting as a Georgian town surrounded by fields gently transitioning to the Wyre Forest should be protected to preserve the environment and to maintain its attractiveness for tourists.	Support for paragraph 11.26 noted.
	<a href="#">LPP0599</a>	11.30	Support	I believe that it is important not only to protect the landscape of the river Severn itself, but of those landscapes that are view-able from the river valley as these are a valuable part of its unique setting.	Support for paragraph 11.30 noted.
Bewdley Town Council	<a href="#">LPP0832</a>	Policy 11E	Support	In terms of Bewdley's riverside, policy must allow for sensitive regeneration of specific riverside areas.	Support for Policy 11 E noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Canal & River Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1012</a>	Policy 11E	Support	The Trust welcomes Policy 11E which supports positive canalside development for the creation of an attractive and high-quality environment.	Support for Policy 11 E noted.
Ramblers Association	<a href="#">LPPO4876</a>	Section 11	Support	Walking both healthy and enjoyable. Enjoyment stimulated by beauty of environments accessed. Wyre Forest particularly well-endowed. Ramblers Association supports Section 11 and Policy 25: Green Belt should restrict urban sprawl. Urges District Council to maintain and implement these policies vigorously without allowing the local plan process to water them down.	Support for Section 11 noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO572</a>	11C	Support	Support for Policy 11C.	Support for Policy 11C noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO620</a>	Policy 11E	Support	Support for regenerating the waterways.	Support for [Policy 11 E] Regenerating the Waterways noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1225</a>	Policy 11D	Comment	We strongly support the aspiration of the plan to deliver net-gain for biodiversity and would welcome the opportunity to work with WFDC to refine the policy as the local plan develops. To achieve this we recommend that preliminary ecological assessment or biodiversity impact assessments are undertaken as early as possible in the planning process (including prior to allocation) to establish the baseline biodiversity, evaluate each site's deliverability and to determine how net gain for biodiversity can be	Comments are noted. Agree with many of these issues raised. We also welcome the opportunity to work with WCC to refine this policy as the emerging Local Plan progresses.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>delivered.</p> <p>The policy refers to the "ecological network of wildlife corridors" which link "biodiversity areas", including areas identified for habitat restoration and creation.</p> <p>These "ecological networks and wildlife corridors" should be explicit and clearly included within the Policies Map or other map, and the evidence base behind their definition clearly expressed and robustly defensible.</p> <p>A clear definition of biodiversity net-gain should also be provided to accompany the policy and to ensure that net gain is clearly defined and a process for its determination is in place. A simple target should be established to demonstrate net-gain has been achieved for a given scheme. This could be, for instance, that post-development the baseline biodiversity unit value receives 25% biodiversity unit uplift. This calculation would ideally be independently audited by a third party and confirmed in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the planning process pre-determination or through condition discharge. This approach would be similar to that adopted within the April 2014 Biodiversity &amp; Development SPD supporting Lichfield District Council's adopted plan</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>(February 2015).</p> <p>We would recommend the Principles and Guidance for Biodiversity Net Gain (<a href="https://www.cieem.net/biodiversity-net-gain-principles-and-guidance-for-ukconstruction-and-developments">https://www.cieem.net/biodiversity-net-gain-principles-and-guidance-for-ukconstruction-and-developments</a>) as a source of information and guidance. It should be noted that further guidance on biodiversity net-gain is intended to be produced by CIEEM and partners in early 2018.</p> <p>The following additional wording is proposed to be added to the reasoned justification: "In order to accurately determine whether no net loss and enhancement or net gain for biodiversity can be delivered by development, the LPA expects that, when requested, precise ecological assessment by suitably qualified people to accepted national standards is undertaken, sufficient to determine net impacts/change".</p> <p>We would welcome further dialogue with regards whether a collaborative project could be initiated to formulate a locally tailored 'biodiversity metric' to help with this calculation. For instance, this could incentivise measures such as sustainable urban drainage (green roofs, living walls etc) which have both biodiversity value as well as contributing towards the</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>aspirations for flooding and surface water drainage threaded throughout the Plan elsewhere. The aspirations for conservation of acid grassland, heathland and wetland networks could also be given greater weight through a locally tailored biodiversity calculator.</p> <p>We strongly support the requirement for enhancement measures for biodiversity to be required at all scales of development (where appropriate to do so) and especially for enhancement features to be required within the built development. Inexpensive and valuable enhancement measures, especially when considered at this early and strategically cohesive manner, will enable small scale developments to also demonstrate how they have achieved net-gain for biodiversity.</p> <p>Further cross-reference should be made to the emerging suite of Green Infrastructure Concept Plans (see comments under policy 14) which can provide more detailed and locally appropriate enhancement specifications.</p> <p>Development should provide for the long term management and monitoring of biodiversity features retained and enhanced within the site and for those features created off-site to compensate for development impacts. It should</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				be noted that the 2017 EIA Regulations place greater weight both on the requirement to monitor mitigation measures and for access (by both regulator and applicant) to suitable expertise in order to evaluate EIA proposals.	
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">LPP01316</a>	Policy 11D	Comment	<p>We are concerned about the impact of 6,000 homes on the natural environment. A particularly sensitive site is the Wilden Pools adjacent to the Wilden Marsh SSSI. Development at Wilden could affect the water table and hence the marsh environment. Hurcott Pastures SSI and Hurcott Woods Local Nature Reserve are also areas where new housing developments could damage the local ecosystem.</p> <p>Spennells Fields offer a range of habitats including important nesting sites for Corn Buntings, Skylarks, and Linnets along with badger setts and bat roosts. Corn Buntings, Linnets and Skylarks require large open spaces to thrive and would not nest in a “Green Corridor”.</p>	Comments are noted. Agree that the protection of SSSI sites within the District is important. The emerging Local Plan will aim to continue the protection of the SSSI sites.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPP01399</a>	Policy 11D	Comment	<p>We are concerned about the impact of homebuilding and roads on the natural environment. A particularly sensitive site is the Wilden Pools adjacent to the Wilden Marsh SSSI. Development at Wilden could affect the water table and hence the marsh environment.</p>	Comments are noted. Ecological assessments of potential allocation sites with wildlife concerns will be undertaken in the next stage of the Local Plan Review.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Hurcott Pastures SSSI and Hurcott Woods Local Nature Reserve are also areas where new housing developments could damage the local ecosystem and species therein.</p> <p>We would expect full ecological surveys to be done on each parcel in the Local Plan when development is considered. The Draft Local Plan is light on recognising ecological constraints on development apart from mentioning mitigation at Hurcott Pastures and discounting land adjacent to Puxton Marsh. Spennells Fields, for instance, 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 (common pipistrelle, soprano pipistrelle and brown long-eared bat species). Also sighted in Wyre Forest in areas earmarked for development are European Otters. The rare Tower Mustard plant thrives along the lanes adjoining Stanklyn Lane. 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 be</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				respected.	
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01534</a>	Policy 11D	Comment	Requirement of development to deliver “a net gain in biodiversity” is not in accordance with the NPPF which, at paragraph 109, requires the planning system to “minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible”, clearly not a blanket requirement for biodiversity gains.	<p>‘Sustainable development’ is the golden thread that runs through the whole of the NPPF. The ‘environment’ is one of the three dimensions to sustainable development. The NPPF para 7 states that an environmental role is:</p> <p>“contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.” The NPPF para 9 states that:</p> <p>“Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people’s quality of life, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moving from a net loss of bio-diversity to achieving net gains for nature.”</li> </ul> <p>The NPPF aspires for 'net gain' or expects 'no net loss' <u>at a minimum</u>. Therefore, it is implied that <i>any</i> biodiversity loss could fail the NPPF's Sustainable Development principles and could constitute significant harm. Paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (DCLG 2012) states that "Planning policies and decisions must reflect and, where appropriate,</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					promote relevant EU obligations and statutory requirements."
	<a href="#">LPP04780</a>	Policy 11D	Comment	<p>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>A particularly sensitive site is the Wilden Pools adjacent to the Wilden Marsh SSSI. Development at Wilden could affect the water table and hence the marsh environment. Hurcott Pastures SSSI and Hurcott Woods Local Nature Reserve are also areas where new housing developments could damage the local ecosystem and species therein.</p> <p>I would expect full ecological surveys to be done on each parcel in the Local Plan when development is considered. The Draft Local Plan is light on recognising ecological constraints on development apart from mentioning mitigation at Hurcott Pastures and discounting land adjacent to Puxton Marsh.</p>	Comments are noted. Further evidence base work is being done to inform the next stage of plan-making. This will include ecological appraisals of potential site allocations. This evidence will be used to inform the site selection process and will be made available at the Pre-Submission consultation stage for public viewing.
	<a href="#">LPP01703</a>	Plough Lane, Far Forest	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wildlife conservation: natural habitat</li> </ul>	Objection and comments are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				will be affected.	
	<a href="#">LPP01722</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Threat to wildlife.</li> </ul>	Objection and comments are noted. However, comments on proposed site allocations are not relevant to Policy 11d. Therefore no policy change required.
	<a href="#">LPP01737</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wildlife and habitats will be lost.</li> </ul>	Objection and comments are noted. However, comments on proposed site allocations are not relevant to Policy 11d. Therefore no policy change required.
	<a href="#">LPP03693</a>	Policy 11D	Object	<p>There are many distinct varieties of plant and animal life in Spennells fields. These range from bees, butterflies, unique pollinators, the cinnabar moth, there are kestrels, Badgers, Skylarks, Linnets and Bats all these have been recorded.</p> <p>It provides a good and unique variety. That will be lost should Option A take place. No amount of design will enable these plant and animal life to flourish if Option A goes ahead.</p> <p>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</p>	Objection and comments are noted. However, comments on proposed site allocations are not relevant to Policy 11d. Therefore no policy change required.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				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. I therefore object to Option A on the basis of it being unlawful and not encouraging bio diversity.	
	<a href="#">LPP03899</a>	Policy 11D	Object	There is no previous evidence that the Council can use land efficiently and sensitively with good design. I object to these proposals.	Objection is noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01226</a>	11.32	Comment	The second sentence refers to sites being linked into a "detailed" network. The word "detailed" seems an unusual one; something like "more comprehensive and robust" may be better.	Comment is noted. Suggested change will be considered.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPP01059</a>	Policy 11D	Comment	<p>We are pleased to support the intent of this policy and the weight it gives to enhancement as well as protection of biodiversity. We would however recommend some amendments, which we believe would aid clarity and provide a more robust policy framework in this regard.</p> <p>We welcome the proposal to take full account of the ecological network of wildlife corridors in decision making as set out in Section 1. It is important that the policy takes a wider view</p>	Comments are noted. We welcome the opportunity to work with Worcestershire Wildlife Trust and Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership to develop the evidence base for this policy and to refine the policy further as the emerging Local Plan progresses.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>than just focussing on designated sites and so we endorse this approach. We would however recommend that the relevant corridors be mapped or otherwise defined so as to aid clarity in future. In connection with this we would also recommend that the 'corridors' take account of associated habitats listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act 2006 and BAP priorities. We would further recommend that the council engages closely with partner organisations including the Wildlife Trust and Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership to develop the evidence base for this before the final plan is submitted.</p> <p>We fully support the need for development to deliver net gains in biodiversity as set out in Section 2. We would however recommend that you delete the word 'major' from the first sentence so that it reads '<i>Net gains in biodiversity will be sought from all development proposals...</i>' The last two sentences of Section 2 make clear that gains sought will be proportionate to the scale of development and that gains within the built environment will be sought for all scales of development and so we do not believe that the modifying word is required in the first sentence. There will be many cases where relatively small developments can offer biodiversity enhancement (for example</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>through careful consideration of landscaping elements) and these should be sought where possible. It would be helpful to define biodiversity net gain in this context so that all parties are clear about what is expected in this regard. Recently established principles for this can be found in 'Biodiversity Net Gain – Good practice principles for development' jointly produced by CIRIA, CIEEM and IEMA and guidance on implementation of net gain processes is being developed for release in early 2018. It will also be necessary to be able to determine the starting point for net gain discussions and so securing an appropriate level of biodiversity information will be important. Guidance on this is available (for example in BS42020:2013 Biodiversity – Code of practice for planning and development) and we would be pleased to discuss the practicalities of this with the council in due course.</p> <p>Finally, we would recommend that you re-draft Section 4 to read '<i>...development will provide for the long term management and monitoring of biodiversity...</i>' so as to more accurately reflect the need to monitor results in order to inform future management decisions.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO601</a>	11D	Support	As well as SSSIs & Nature reserves, transitional habitats between them and settlement	Comments are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 11: A UNIQUE PLACE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>boundaries must be protected.</p> <p>North and west of Bewdley fields between the forest and the town are vital for large numbers of bird &amp; insect species which would suffer if these open spaces were lost. Many species from the forest also uses these open fields for hunting and feeding.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Miller Homes	<a href="#">LPP0977</a>	Policy 12	Support	<p><b>Support</b> the inclusion within Part B of proposed Policy 12 of a ‘subject to viability’ clause with respect to the requirement for development to provide or contribute, financially or in kind, towards the provision of infrastructure needed to support it.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that:</p> <p><i>“Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable”.</i></p> <p>The NPPF identifies that where obligations are being sought through the determination of planning applications, LPAs should take account of changes in market conditions over time and, wherever appropriate, be sufficiently flexible to prevent planned development being stalled or undelivered due to viability issues.</p>	Comments and support noted for ensuring viability is considered.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				Important for the new Local Plan to take appropriate evidence and development viability into consideration when setting and applying policies relating to providing and contributing towards strategic infrastructure.	
Canal & River Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1014</a>	Policy 12	Object	Previous comments on Infrastructure Delivery Plan do not appear to have been taken into account in this document or latest IDP.	Policy 12 does not preclude Canal & River Trust infrastructure and is a policy for all infrastructure providers. The IDP has live status and will continually be updated prior to the next stage of consultation. As part of this process your comments will be considered.
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1041</a>	Policy 12	Comment	There will be a continuing need to recognise the importance (for business and employment) of ease of access to major road and rail infrastructure, underlining the importance of supporting the redesign of Mustow Green and other improvements to other routes providing access toward Birmingham and Worcester.	Policy 12 does not preclude works to this area. Any improvements required will be identified by transport modelling being undertaken by the highways authority Worcestershire County Council.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">LPPO1064</a>	Policy 12	Support	We would encourage an integrated approach to infrastructure delivery, as set out in Policy 12, whilst maximising opportunities for providing flood risk management benefits as part of wider infrastructure works.	Comments and Support Noted. Flood Risk requirements will be included within the IDP.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning	<a href="#">LPPO1228</a>	Policy 12	Comment	Education Provision: Current analysis of established households and child data, as at the population census	Comments noted and WFDC will continue to work with WCC children's services to establish

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Economy & Performance				<p>2011, derived a pupil yield of 0.28 pupils per dwelling.</p> <p>At primary school level, known children data is only available for 4 years from the current date, as the data is based on actual births. At primary school level, there is localised surplus capacity within the area to support elements of housing growth but this will be insufficient to meet the needs of the proposed growth. However, this is not consistent and in some schools there are either no surplus places or insufficient surplus places to maintain an acceptable level of places for families moving in to the area or to absorb the additional places required as a result of housing development. Therefore, where there is a need for additional places within an area additional provision will be required to support the level of housing set out in the local plan.</p> <p>At secondary school level, pupil numbers across Kidderminster are set to increase as a result of higher primary school numbers coming through the system and are set to rise to 649, exceeding the published admission number (or 'PAN', which sets out the number of pupils that can be admitted into each year group) of 635 in September 2021. Current forecast data suggests that pupil numbers will remain at or above PAN for the foreseeable future which may result in a need to expand secondary schools to accommodate pupil number growth from development. In Stourport, secondary school pupil numbers are set to increase and exceed the PAN of 224 from September 2018 onwards. Current forecasts suggest that pupil numbers will</p>	future need for school places through the plan development lifetime.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>remain at or above PAN for the foreseeable future, again with the resultant need to expand secondary schools. In Bewdley, current forecasts suggest that secondary school pupil numbers are not anticipated to exceed the PAN for the foreseeable forecast period up to 2026, but this will be reviewed regularly and may change as a result of changing circumstances including development plan allocations and windfall.</p> <p>In conclusion, there are currently sufficient school places within the area to maintain the current level of forecast pupil numbers before any development takes place. Where there is an identifiable need, for example in the secondary phase of education in Stourport, the Local Authority will continue to adapt to demographic change in ensuring there is a sufficient supply of statutory school age places within the Wyre Forest area.</p> <p>Children, Families and Communities (WCC) have no specific preference for the options put forward under Option A and Option B. However, pockets of growth consisting of small-scale development will support existing infrastructure in rural locations, although the accumulative impact of such development may result in a need for either school expansions or new schools. Any school expansions will be subject to discussion with existing schools. Large-scale development will have a wider and more far-reaching impact on school places and, depending on the outcomes of this consultation, it is most likely that a new primary school will be required to support the level of provision in the east</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>of Kidderminster as set out under options A and B. The IDP provides further detail of options.</p> <p>The Local Authority will continue to monitor pupil numbers and, where new infrastructure is required as a direct result of housing proposals, will seek to mitigate the impact of the development on education provision through s106 developer contributions.</p>	
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1536</a>	Policy 12	Comment	<p>Policy acceptable in principle but does not refer to CIL and how this will be used to fund strategic infrastructure. The mechanisms by which the strategic infrastructure is to be delivered should be clearly set out to ensure that developers are fully aware of any requirements relating to their schemes so that the necessary financial planning relating to securing land options/agreements can be undertaken from the outset.</p> <p>An Eastern Relief Road will require a funding mix, which could include the utilisation of monies collected through a CIL charging schedule.</p>	The policy is designed to allow for all funding methods to infrastructure. CIL scoping will be considered within the next viability run scheduled for the summer of 2018. No policy change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO1953</a>	Policy 12 Infrastructure	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overcrowded schools currently.</li> <li>• 3 local hospitals are in special measures.</li> <li>• Impossible to get a doctors appointment currently.</li> </ul>	Policy 12 allows for infrastructure projects to be funded requirements for new provision is undertaken by the appropriate infrastructure provider and detailed within the IDP. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO2004</a>	Policy 12	Comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to solve our current problems before adding</li> </ul>	Existing problems with public

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		Infrastructure		<p>to the load.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to address all the inadequacies of today - emergency services, doctors, roads etc.</li> </ul>	services are the responsibility of the appropriate service provider. This policy is designed to allow for new infrastructure works to be carried out as necessary. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO2320</a>	Policy 12 Infrastructure	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure will also need to be developed if Spennells/Offmore is extended.</li> <li>• Will increase pressure on health services, schools etc.</li> <li>• Could potential create jobs but would local people get these jobs?</li> </ul>	This policy will allow for new infrastructure as identified by the provider. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3367</a>	Policy 12	Object	Can Kidderminster sustain such an increase of population? Infrastructure: Doctors, Schools, Dentists, jobs, roads and bus services, which are under pressure now. Hospitals alone are another argument.	This policy will allow for new infrastructure as identified by the provider. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3639</a>	Paragraph 12.2	Object	I oppose using a more substantial urban extension for development on greenfield sites, as I believe our local housing needs can be met without using this.	This policy responds to the settlement strategy. Thus the policy itself is correct for the current strategy. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3901</a>	Paragraph 12.2	Object	The Council has ignored 3 independent analyses that shows that development of Green Belt is unnecessary. I strongly object to this plan.	There is no mention of Green Belt within this paragraph. This policy is designed to allow for infrastructure as required not decide where new development

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					is located. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3902</a>	Paragraph 12.3	Object	The Council has ignored 3 independent analyses that shows that development of Green Belt is unnecessary. I strongly object to this plan.	There is no mention of Green Belt within this paragraph. This policy is designed to allow for infrastructure as required not decide where new development is located. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3696</a>	12.3	Object	<p>From the WFIDP it appears that the Council has already preferences for Option A and have not considered this fairly. It appears that “Governments funding will be granted to those who bid unlock the most homes in areas of greatest housing need”</p> <p>In addition additional funding will be received for Eastern By pass.</p> <p>It appears that the WFDC is motivated by this funding and not for the character of Kidderminster, the residents of Kidderminster, the landscape of Kidderminster.</p> <p>I would question and challenge –“greatest housing need “as per statistics see 1 Introduction and context comments.</p> <p>The need is not as you have suggested and described a large amount of exaggeration is included in your submissions.</p> <p>WFIDP identifies additional Policing costs for Option A. Also, Option B does not need as much roadwork and section</p>	From a strategic infrastructure policy perspective these comments will require no change. The WFIDP is a living document and will be updated to reflect the final choice of sites and the infrastructure these sites require to be acceptable in planning terms.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				7.0.12 of the same report says " 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." Save £17.5m.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3528</a>	12.3 Infrastructure	Object	<b>Hospital:</b> 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&E and more services. Reinstating 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?	Worcestershire ACUTE NHS trust has been consulted as part of this planning consultation. Any future infrastructure needs for the hospitals will be identified by them as the provider. Policy 12 enables future infrastructure needs to be met. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3552</a>	Paragraph 12.3	Object	Hagley suffer from daily transient traffic as part of both travel to work between Worcestershire, Birmingham and the Black Country and social and leisure destinations. This is shown with queuing traffic regularly as far back as Hackman's Gate and Blakedown, with further queues experienced in Churchill. Adding further development on the source routes will add significant pressure on an already over stretched, under capacity major road intersection.  It makes perfect sense therefore that a link road MUST now be created to link up with the traffic Island at Fairfield which in turn gives ease of access to junction 4 at Bromsgrove.  Further logic says that the link road should commence	Policy 12 does not preclude works to this area. Any improvements required will be identified by transport modelling being undertaken by the highways authority Worcestershire County Council. No change to policy 12 required.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>BEFORE Blakedown to relieve it too of transient traffic.</p> <p>I have been in touch with members of Blakedown Parish Council and they too are supportive of the need to take measures to alleviate transient traffic along its part of the A456</p> <p>The rail link between Worcester (and other destinations which it serves) is under utilised and restricted by either pay to park or very limited parking facilities.</p> <p>Car parking should be free at all stations with greater capacity needed at both Kidderminster and Blakedown stations.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO4484</a>	12.3 - WFIDP	Comment	<p>The WFIDP as is the Local Plan is very light on the provision of medical services vis:</p> <p>“Secondly, as part of more general advice across Worcestershire, the projected population growth across the County will inevitably lead to increased demand for healthcare, including acute hospital services. Whilst more intensive use of facilities can absorb some increased demand, this is inevitably principally at the margins and the healthcare sector might have to look to CIL (in addition to potentially planning obligations for specific large scale developments) to support the provision of additional health provision, wherever major housing developments are undertaken. This is particularly important for secondary acute healthcare facilities, such as those provided by the</p>	Existing infrastructure deficiencies are the responsibility on the appropriate infrastructure provider. This policy will allow infrastructure to be brought forward to support the proposed growth within this local plan. No policy change required.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Trust, for which planning obligation funding is less frequently allocated than for primary care facilities, such as clinics and surgeries provided within large new developments.”</p> <p>The Wyre Forest Infrastructure Development Plan identifies additional Policing costs for Option A. It is recommended the expanded Lea Castle site within Option B is transferred to Option A. The WFIDP and the Local Plan are very light on the provision of medical services. 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.</p> <p>Having lived in Kidderminster 19 years I have seen it change for the worse and would welcome development if I thought it would genuinely benefit the local community but existing infrastructure; hospitals, doctors surgeries, schools, Dentists, local support in the community social care etc is woefully inadequate now and to add further burden to an already struggling local system is foolhardy at best. It brings to mind the disaster with the parking issues at the newly built leisure centre. Who would have thought consolidating 3 swimming pools into a single centre would have such a huge demand? Remarkable when you think about it and no way to address it after the fact as permission is already in place on the surrounding land.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO4491</a>	Infrastructure Health	Object	As Worcestershire NHS is in special measures NO big housing development should be considered in Wyre Forest	This request is not within the power of the district council. The

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>area until medical provisions for this area are secured. Building houses without a thought to medical provision is irresponsible – No big housing development anywhere in Wyre Forest should be considered until Kidderminster Hospital has an A &amp; E.</p>	<p>local authority is required by central government to produce a local plan. The level of development identified is based on an assessed housing need for the area. Policy 12 is designed to enable future infrastructure needs to be brought forward. No policy change required.</p>
	<p><a href="#">LPPO3939</a></p>	<p>12.3 IDP</p>	<p>Object</p>	<p>The IDP clearly states that additional policing costs would be incurred for Option A. Option B does not require the same level of roadwork and section 7.0.12 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 2012 and in the IDPs of other districts in Worcestershire’. This will save the Council £17.5m as stated in the report.</p> <p>If Option A becomes the preferred option, I suggest the expanded Lea Castle site within Option B, be transferred to Option A. This is recommended in the WFIDP in section 3:</p> <p>‘It should be noted that the expanded Lea Castle site within Option B is preferable to the smaller allocation identified in Option A. This expanded site has the potential to include additional development opportunities such as retail and a new primary school which will assist in providing a more sustainable development. This expanded site also allow the potential for further access from the site onto</p>	<p>These comments are noted but require no change to policy 12. The WFIDP is a live document and will be updated with the infrastructure required as identified and evidenced by the appropriate infrastructure providers.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>A451. However, it should be noted that the A451 is a fast road that has historically suffered from a high accident rate so care would be needed to be taken when considering any access'</p> <p>Large urban estates have evidenced increased anti-social behaviour and increased crime rates. This is referenced in the WFIDP but not included in the Draft Local Plan consultation. Allowing disproportionate urban expansion (almost double the size of existing Spennells estate) is not only, not required, but could result in the need for services to counteract any increase in anti-social behaviour or crime rate.</p> <p>The WFIDP as is the Draft Local Plan is relatively neglectful of the need for enhanced medical services, 'Secondly, as part of more general advice across Worcestershire, the projected population growth across the county will lead to increased demand for healthcare, including acute hospital services</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO4832</a>	12.3	Comment	The Local Plan is light on how medical services will be addressed as a result of the projected population growth.	The requirements for medical infrastructure are identified within the WFIDP. The WFIDP carries live status and will be updated before the next consultation and throughout the lifetime of the plan. No changes to policy 12 required.
	<a href="#">LPPO4918</a>	Infrastructure	Object	The WFIDP as is the Local Plan is very light on the provision	The requirements for medical

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		Plan		<p>of medical services vis:</p> <p>“Secondly, as part of more general advice across Worcestershire, the projected population growth across the County will inevitably lead to increased demand for healthcare, including acute hospital services. Whilst more intensive use of facilities can absorb some increased demand, this is inevitably principally at the margins and the healthcare sector might have to look to CIL (in addition to potentially planning obligations for specific large scale developments) to support the provision of additional health provision, wherever major housing developments are undertaken. This is particularly important for secondary acute healthcare facilities, such as those provided by the Trust, for which planning obligation funding is less frequently allocated than for primary care facilities, such as clinics and surgeries provided within large new developments.”</p> <p>The Wyre Forest Infrastructure Development Plan identifies additional Policing costs for Option A. It is recommended the expanded Lea Castle site within Option B is transferred to Option A. The WFIDP and the Local Plan are very light on the provision of medical services. 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.</p> <p>I have seen Kidderminster change for the worse and would welcome development if I thought it would genuinely</p>	<p>infrastructure are identified within the WFIDP. The WFIDP carries live status and will be updated before the next consultation and throughout the lifetime of the plan. No changes to policy 12 required.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>benefit the local community but existing infrastructure; hospitals, doctors surgeries, schools, Dentists, local support in the community social care etc is woefully inadequate now and to add further burden to an already struggling local system is foolhardy at best. It brings to mind the disaster with the parking issues at the newly built leisure centre. Who would have thought consolidating 3 swimming pools into a single centre would have such a huge demand? Remarkable when you think about it and no way to address it after the fact as permission is already in place on the surrounding land.</p>	
Place Partnership Ltd	<a href="#">LPPO1112</a>	Paragraph 12.3 IDP	Comment	<p>WP, WMP and HWFRS are supportive of the proposal for the IDP to detail the infrastructure required to support the proposals and development sites in the Local Plan. We also welcome the recognition that both the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 mechanisms will be required to deliver this.</p> <p>Pleased that the contents of the IDP on pages 60 – 61 reflect the representations that we submitted to the Council on the 05 September 2016 and 05 January 2017.</p> <p>We would like to update the aforementioned representations by enclosing in <b>Appendix 2</b> details of the most recent Secretary of State and Planning Inspectorate appeal decisions supporting Section 106 contributions for the police service. They confirm that the principle of and methodology used to request such contributions are wholly compliant with the CIL Regulations. They also confirm that</p>	<p>These comments are welcomed and the information provided will be considered in the WFIDP update prior to the next consultation.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>'infrastructure' is a broad term and includes not just buildings, but equipment and vehicles too, with all types acceptable within the terms of the CIL Regulations.</p> <p>Disappointed to see that the table enclosed in Appendix A of the IDP has not taken into account the aforementioned representations. No reason is given for this. However, please find enclosed in <b>Appendix 3</b> an update for inclusion in the IDP.</p> <p>Overall, we trust that this response is of assistance to the preparation of the Wyre Forest Local Plan Review, but should there be any queries or further information is needed, please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	
Worcestershire Primary Care CCG	<a href="#">LPPO1115</a>	Document	Comment	Having read through the relevant sections of the WFIDP and Local Plan Review Preferred Options, we have nothing to add. We would, however, comment that the costings in section 4.2.4 are now out of date, but note that these aren't included in the appendix so assume there will be opportunities to update these as the process progresses.	Further consultation with infrastructure providers will be undertaken to ensure information is kept up to date as befits the live status of the WFIDP.
	<a href="#">LPPO2497</a>	WFIDP	Object	The WFIDP/Local Plan is very light on the provision of medical services.	The requirements for medical infrastructure are identified within the WFIDP. The WFIDP carries live status and will be updated before the next consultation and throughout the lifetime of the plan. No changes to policy 12 required.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Education & Skills Funding Agency	<a href="#">LPPO1048</a>	12.4	Support	<p>The ESFA welcomes reference within the plan to support the development of appropriate social and community infrastructure as outlined in paragraph 12.4 and the specific commitment to continue investing in education infrastructure. it would be helpful if key national policies relating to the provision of school places are referenced in the Local Plan:-</p> <p>NPPF para.72 - LPAs should take proactive, positive and collaborative approach to provision of new schools ... and give great weight to need to create, expand or alter schools to widen choice in education.</p> <p>ESFA supports principle of safeguarding land for new schools as per para. 72 of NPPF.</p> <p>WFDC should also have regards to 'Planning for Schools Development (2011) DCLG/DfE</p>	<p>Support of existing policy is welcomed reference to specific NPPF paragraphs isn't necessary on every policy as all policies must be NPPF compliant. To do so would increase the plan length considerably and not change the policy wording itself.</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council as a statutory consultant has provided evidence on all school place requirements.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3958</a>	Infrastructure	Comment	<p>Extra housing will put pressure on existing public services i.e. hospitals, GP surgeries, schools. Currently Worcester Acute Trust is in special measures and unable to sustain a quality service for the existing population of Wyre Forest. Kidderminster Hospital was downgraded years ago and provides limited services for Wyre Forest residents. Current GP practices in Wyre Forest have implemented telephone consultations rather than face to face consultations due to pressures on capacity which results in an impersonal doctor/patient relationship. Current GP practices would not</p>	<p>All infrastructure requirements are identified and evidenced by the appropriate infrastructure provider for all the themes mentioned in this response. Policy 12 is designed to enable future infrastructure need to be delivered. No change required.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>be able to accommodate an influx of new patients.</p> <p>Local primary schools are all full and would not be able to cope with the extra children new housing development would bring. Therefore any development should be large enough to warrant extra primary schools, GP surgeries and other community services in order for the development to be sustainable.</p> <p>We would like to propose a solution to the problem with Hurcott Lane being a “rat run”. The junction between A456 and Hurcott Lane is already a black spot for accidents and similar problems exist between the junction of A451 and Hurcott Lane. Any closure of either end of Hurcott Lane would result in traffic diverting through the village and along Hurcott Road which is even narrower than Hurcott Lane. It would also divert traffic from the Birmingham Road along Baldwin Road instead and this road already has an increase in traffic at rush hour with commuters cutting through to access Hurcott Road/Chester Road North.</p> <p>We propose that access is available either end of Hurcott Lane to access Hurcott Woods nature reserve only with bollards preventing through traffic from either end. Hurcott Road should be made a bridal path/cycle path/pedestrian access only to get to Hurcott Woods. Bollards would be required adjacent to the current bridal/public footpath where Hurcott Road narrows on the blind bend. This would make it safer for pedestrians walking their dogs and families with young children as well as encouraging cyclists and</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				walkers to use this lovely country side for recreational exercise.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3903</a>	Paragraph 12.4	Object	The Council has ignored 3 independent analyses that shows that development of Green Belt is unnecessary. I strongly object to this plan.	There is no mention of Green Belt within this paragraph. This policy is designed to allow for infrastructure as required not decide where new development is located. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3904</a>	Paragraph 12.5	Object	The Council has ignored 3 independent analyses that shows that development of Green Belt is unnecessary. I strongly object to this plan.	There is no mention of Green Belt within this paragraph. This policy is designed to allow for infrastructure as required not decide where new development is located. No change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO3905</a>	Paragraph 12.6	Object	The Council has ignored 3 independent analyses that shows that development of Green Belt is unnecessary. I strongly object to this plan.	There is no mention of Green Belt within this paragraph. This policy is designed to allow for infrastructure as required not decide where new development is located. No change required.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1229</a>	Paragraph 12.6	Comment	The Worcestershire and Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEPs are referred to here as "infrastructure providers". These bodies do not directly provide infrastructure, but rather seek and coordinate funding for others to deliver, so it may not be appropriate to refer to them in these terms.	Agree description of LEP's will be changed.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPPO1482</a>	Local Infrastructure	Comment	6,000 homes by 2034 mean approximately 20,000 new people in Wyre Forest District. How will the Hospital and	All infrastructure providers have been consulted as part of this

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>emergency services cope with this growth? Even halving this number to the number which I believe is realistic requires significant investment.</p> <p>Expanded residential developments requires proper infrastructure to support its current and future residents. We have found no evidence of future funding to support this. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hospital services</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Kidderminster Hospital was downgraded several years ago and is ill-equipped for an enlarged population.</li> <li>○ Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS is considered to be a failing trust by the CQC.</li> <li>○ Worcestershire Health and Care NHS Trust have moved or downgraded some mental health services at Kidderminster, with service users and their relatives needing to travel to Redditch.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>GP &amp; Dental surgeries</b> – We are not confident that there will be adequate provision of GP and dental services in a greatly enlarged Spennells.</li> <li>• <b>Schools</b> – 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. 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 may be</li> </ul>	<p>process to identify their themes infrastructure requirements. This information is contained within the WFIDP. The delivery of these services is the responsibility of each provider with the responsibility for enabling planning policy falling to WFDC.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>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 difficult at the beginning and end of the school day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Local shops, pharmacy and post office</b> – We are 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> – We are not confident that adequate local leisure facilities will be built to serve an enlarged estate, leading to a soulless estate with no sense of community and heightened youth alienation.</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 town centre on brownfield sites.</li> </ul>	
Summerfield Against Land Transformation	<a href="#">LPP01615</a>	Section 12 - Infrastructure	Comment	Given the scale of the proposed development thought must be given to key educational and health services to support the residents of the new housing stock. This will require an expansion of existing schools and the creation of a new	National planning policy dictates how local plans are developed with public participation stages and elected members voting

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>health centre/GP practice. This is true of both options, but especially Option A, given the density of housing envisaged.</p> <p>We accept and support the need for infrastructure development to reflect the ambition of a Local Plan. However, we see this draft Plan being cynically manipulated — via Option A — to justify the relief road, resolve pre-existing problems and to attract capital funding.</p>	elements of the plan. This ensures the process of plan development is democratic and fair. The support for additional infrastructure is welcomed. No policy change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO2323</a>	Option A - Spennells	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have schools/hospitals etc. been considered?</li> <li>• How will Kidderminster/Worcester hospitals cope when they are already in special measures and struggling?</li> <li>• It will put pressure onto the education system in Wyre Forest.</li> </ul>	
Network Rail	<a href="#">LPPO1141</a>	Transport & Accessibility	Comment	<p>Network Rail owns, maintains, renews and enhances the railway infrastructure in England, Wales and Scotland and is a statutory consultee for:</p> <p>(a) Any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and</p> <p>(b) For any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order); in addition you are required to consult the Office of Rail and Road (ORR).</p>	These comments are welcomed and will be considered in the transport section of the WFIDP and transport policy 13.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><i>The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 SCHEDULE 4 Consultations before the grant of permission Development which is likely to result in a material increase in the volume or material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway.</i></p> <p><i>The operator of the network which includes or consists of the railway in question, and the Secretary of State for Transport.</i></p> <p>Traffic over a level crossing can be vehicular, pedestrian, cyclists or horse-riders and that proposals do not have to be adjacent to a level crossing to potentially impact the crossing. The council should also be made aware that several proposals over time can also have a cumulative impact upon a level crossing or level crossings in the area, and here, developer contributions could be pooled from several developments to fund mitigation measures.</p>	
Rushock Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1106</a>	Infrastructure	Comment	<p>We are concerned about the effects of the proposed residential developments on already overcrowded roads, medical services, social services and schools in the district. Developments of this size will very likely encourage commuters to Birmingham and elsewhere which will generate major traffic problems.</p>	<p>All infrastructure requirements are identified and evidenced by the appropriate infrastructure provider for all the themes mentioned in this response. Policy 12 is designed to enable future infrastructure need to be delivered.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO4730</a>	Section 12	Comment	<p>It is good to see in this section (Policy 12) reference to the Strategic Infrastructure required for these large developments. It should however be made extremely clear in any future document that no land will finally be released</p>	<p>Development location is not relevant to policy 12 which is designed to enable future infrastructure needs to be met.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 12: STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>from Green Belt or ADR until the council and developers have costed and have funding in place for any infrastructure required.</p> <p>No other comment on this section as I don't know anything about the WFIDP or what this 'living' document proposes but see previous comments on health and the requirement in the proposals for new schools. Where is the money to pay for this coming from and what is Plan B when there is no money available? Is 12.7 extra tax or local rates?</p>	No policy change required.
	<a href="#">LPPO4782</a>	Section 12	Comment	<p>A cautionary tale from our neighbours in Bromsgrove. They had been offered a 'useful' contribution' from Birmingham (presumably not unlike the finance that WFDC are looking forward to receiving for the station, and apparently, the southern bypass).</p> <p>Birmingham has the largest housing department in England and due to its financial muscle and much larger finance legal departments is at a great advantage in discussions with its County neighbours.</p>	This comment has no impact on current policy development. Cross Boundary issues are identified through the appropriate mechanism.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO622</a>	Transport	Comment	Need better reliable bus services and links from Bewdley to Kidderminster Station.	Comments noted. Almost all bus services in Worcestershire are now provided on a commercial basis, without any intervention from the County Council. Your comments will be passed to the local commercial bus operator, Diamond, for their consideration.
Highways England	<a href="#">LPPO790</a>	Policy 13	Comment	<p>Highways England ('we') are responsible for the operation and maintenance of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in England. The network includes all major motorways and trunk roads. Wyre Forest District lies in close proximity to the M5, which is located approximately 6 miles to the east of the district.</p> <p>Highways England has undertaken a preliminary review in order to consider the potential traffic implications associated with the allocated housing, employment and retail development as set out in Options A and B of the consultation version of the Wyre Forest Local Plan. We have identified that the level of traffic generated from the allocated sites within both options is similar and we do not have specific preference as to which option is brought forward. We note however that there may be material implication for our network at M5 Junctions 3, 4 and 6 arising from increased levels of traffic</p>	Comments noted. As with all Local Development Plan reviews, Worcestershire County Council will continue to work closely with Highways England, using available data and information to monitor and manage the forecast impacts of planned development growth, and pursue mitigation measures as and when appropriate.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>associated with development in Wyre Forest.</p> <p>In order to develop a clearer understanding of the implications of the proposed allocation of development for the SRN, more detailed traffic assessment of M5 Junction 4 is a priority. This junction is already affected by development arising from the plans of Bromsgrove District and Birmingham City Councils. The implications of development traffic at M5 Junction 3 are likely to be affected by traffic growth associated with plans and strategies of Bromsgrove District Council, the Black Country Authorities and Transport for West Midlands.</p> <p>Highways England will seek to work in partnership with you and Worcestershire County Council as the Local Highway Authority to consider these implications and identify if any mitigation measures are required to support the identified growth in Wyre Forest District.</p> <p>Highways England will therefore seek to encourage on-going engagement with Wyre Forest District Council and Worcestershire County Council during and after the public Local Plan consultation in order to identify any necessary highway improvement schemes to ensure the SRN continues to operate its primary role as a strategic route for</p>	

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				through traffic.	
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO891</a>	Policy 13	Comment	<p>Additional Suggestions and Omissions:</p> <p>A policy to improve Bewdley's parking regime, especially that on the Wribbenhall side. Suggest a scheme to use the Bewdley Rowing Club's car park thereby enabling a financial incentive to improve the Club's fortunes and property and help the town with its parking problems.</p>	Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council is very supportive of exploring this option further, which has the potential to significantly improve access to Bewdley; boosting the local economy.
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1042</a>	Policy 13	Comment	<p>Freight proposals - need to be aware of incremental developments and impact of increased freight movements over time.</p> <p>Support need to improve direct rail services to London/Bristol and increase speed of services to Birmingham/Bristol.</p> <p>More parking at Blakedown will not help with use of direct rail services from Kidderminster. More parking is needed at Kidderminster itself. Need to assess road improvements required for new Worcester Parkway station.</p>	Comments noted. The proposal to improve parking at Blakedown Station (LTP4 Scheme WFST5) is to improve access to rail for residents of the Wyre Forest, for who Blakedown would be the nearest rail station, such as residents of Chaddesley Corbett, for example. The business case for Worcestershire Parkway included an extensive assessment of road based trip generation. A number of access improvements are being pursued to support access to the new station by a variety of transport modes, once it opens to the public.
Network Rail	<a href="#">LPPO1147</a>	Policy 13(B), Paras. 13.21 and 13.23	Comment	There are level crossings at Blakedown Railway Station and Hartlebury Railway Station. Increased pedestrians and vehicle usage at the level crossing	Comments noted. Any investment in rail infrastructure will be developed in full compliance with Guidance for

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>could increase the risk scores at both level crossings. There could also be an increase in trespass. It is key for any increase in passengers that both stations have adequate parking facilities, which at present both do not have. Blakedown in particular is a problem as parked cars on the approach roads hinder sighting and visibility of the level crossing; Network Rail would not want this scenario to be repeated at Hartlebury. In addition, both stations do not have access over the railway other than at the road level crossings.</p> <p>There are also a number of footpath level crossings in the area too (Blakedown Viaduct, Harborough Hill, Lambs Farm). Closure of these should form part of the criteria for bringing any sites forward for development in the immediate area. The stopping up of the level crossings should be promoted under S257 of the Planning Act given the nature / amount of usage that would arise as a result of the proposed large developments. Closure under s257 would be led by the developer(s) who would fully fund the process and any mitigation measures.</p> <p>Councils are urged to take the view that level crossings can be impacted in a variety of ways by planning proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By a proposal being directly next to a level crossing</li> <li>• By the cumulative effect of developments</li> </ul>	<p>Rail Investment Projects, which requires consideration of all of the concerns raised, and will result in a net betterment of rail infrastructure, to reduce the risk of accidents. The prevalence of at-grade level crossings on the Stourbridge Line is unsurprising, given the evolved nature of this route. Worcestershire County Council will continue to work with Network Rail, Train Operating Companies, Wyre Forest District Council and other partners to take advantage of opportunities to close any at-grade level crossings and replace these with grade separated, safer alternatives, where funding and resources can be identified.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>added over time in the vicinity of a level crossing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By the type of level crossing involved e.g. where pedestrians only are allowed to use the level crossing, but a proposal involves allowing cyclists to use the route</li> <li>• By the construction of large developments (commercial and residential) where road access to and from the site includes a level crossing or the level / type of use of a level crossing increases as a result of diverted traffic or of a new highway</li> <li>• By developments that might impede pedestrians ability to hear approaching trains at a level crossing, e.g. new airports or new runways / highways / roads</li> <li>• By proposals that may interfere with pedestrian and vehicle users' ability to see level crossing warning signs</li> <li>• By any developments for schools, colleges or nurseries where minors in numbers may be using the level crossing</li> <li>• By any proposal that may cause blocking back across the level crossing</li> <li>• By any proposal which may see a level crossing impacted by the introduction of cycling or walking routes</li> </ul> <p>Developments within the council area should be</p>	

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>accompanied by a TS/TA which includes consideration of the impact of proposals upon level crossings with mitigation implemented as required. We would encourage the Council to adopt specific policy wording to ensure that the impact of proposed new development (including cumulative impact) on the risk at existing level crossings is assessed by the developer(s), and suitable mitigation incorporated within the development proposals and funded by the developer(s). TS/TAs should be undertaken in conjunction with the local highways authority with advice from Network Rail.</p> <p>Future development proposals should also take into account the increases in pedestrian and vehicular traffic and developer contributions (either via CIL or S106) used to provide bridges for passengers to cross the railway when road barriers are down.</p> <p>The Preferred Options document includes enhancements proposed for Hartlebury Railway Station and Blakedown Railway Station (including proposals for increased vehicle parking), both of which have level crossings. Should development proposals in the Blakedown / Hartlebury areas impact upon the level crossings then any mitigation measures must be fully funded by developer contributions (CIL, S106).</p> <p>Proposals for enhancements at Blakedown and Hartlebury stations will need to be agreed with Network Rail and London Midland and must not</p>	

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				increase the risk at the respective level crossings.	
Network Rail	<a href="#">LPPO1148</a>	Policy 13(I & K) and Paras. 13.16 and 13.17	Comment	<p>Transport Assessment's review local needs regarding public transport. This usually focuses on buses, however, they should also take into account impact upon footfall at railway stations. Developers are encouraged to consider including within Transport Assessments trip generation data at railway stations (Blakedown, Kidderminster, Hartlebury etc). Location of the proposal, accessibility and density of the development should be considered in relation to the relevant railway station in the area.</p> <p>Where proposals are likely to increase footfall at railway stations the Local Planning Authority should consider a developer contribution (either via CIL, S106 or unilateral undertaking) to provide funding for enhancements as stations as a result of increased numbers of customers.</p>	Comments Noted. Worcestershire County Council and partners fully understand and embrace the potential of rail to provide much-needed travel choice in Worcestershire. The preparation of the Worcestershire Rail Investment Strategy, and significant technical work to identify and develop investment schemes which has been undertaken to date will be used to lever in funding from a variety of sources, including Developers and the rail industry, to enhance the quality of facilities at rail stations to meet increased demand over time.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1230</a>	Policy 13	Comment	<p>Part C could also refer to Worcestershire's Parking Standards referenced above. Part F appears to be closer to background information than policy. Need to amalgamate with part G. The acronym "SWAT" should be explained. Question the value of the final bullet point in part F.</p> <p>This policy is noted and supported. However, WCC note that the transport modelling for WFDC local plan has not been undertaken, and it is proposed that this exercise is undertaken once an agreed</p>	Comments are noted and welcomed. WFDC will continue to work with WCC to further refine Policy 13 as the Plan progresses.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>development option has been decided upon. The outputs of the modelling will be used to inform the transport schemes in the local plan and in policy 13F.</p> <p>The transport modelling will also consider the impacts of the proposals on strategic routes outside of WFDC and options / proposals for enhancements or alternative provision. The modelling work will require a period of 6 months to complete once we have received a single set of sites. The modelling may identify schemes required outside of the Wyre Forest district boundary. We understand schemes outside of the district cannot be allocated into the WFDC local plan; these will be included and referenced in the infrastructure delivery plan and in policy as required. We welcome the opportunity to work further with WFDC on this policy and the transport and accessibility proposals as the plan develops and to take forward the transport and infrastructure policies once a development option has been confirmed and further evidence-based modelling has been completed.</p>	
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO939</a>	Policy 13F	Comment	<p><b>Park and Ride:</b> need to provide substantial amounts of parking at Kidderminster and Blakedown stations. No capacity for expansion further along line into Birmingham. Parking should be free.</p> <p><b>Swat 10:</b> a rail connection from Stourport to</p>	Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council agrees with the suggestion to boost park and ride facilities at local rail stations, and is committed to pursuing this with partner organisations. With

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				Hartlebury might be desirable but would not be economic as no through traffic is possible.	reference to LTP4 Scheme SWAT10, there is no intention to re-open the railway between Stourport and Hartlebury. Instead, is intended to upgrade this as a high quality active travel (walking and cycling route) to provide a direct link between Hartlebury Station and Stourport. Given the relatively short distances, it should be possible to cycle between Stourport and Hartlebury Station in under 15 minutes, which would be highly attractive and offer significantly improved access to rail for residents of Stourport, at low cost.
Canal & River Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1013</a>	Policy 13	Comment	Policy states that priority will be given to improving infrastructure to support active travel (walking and cycling). Canal towpath is important route for both utility and leisure uses and improvements should be included as infrastructure needs to be delivered to encourage greater use.	Comments noted and agreed.
Historic England	<a href="#">LPPO1277</a>	Policy 13	Comment	Policy 13 sets out some transport initiatives that have also been set out in the Local Transport Plan. Have these been subject to assessment on the impact for the historic environment? If so, how are the issues and opportunities that were raised being incorporated into the Local Plan? Specifically	Comments noted. The LTP4 does not contain proposals for any new road schemes in the Wyre Forest at the present time. Where schemes are identified and brought forward for delivery, consideration of potential

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				undesigned archaeology can be an issue when developing new road schemes.	impact on the historic environment is fully embedded within our scheme development processes.
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">LPP01317</a>	Policy 13	Comment	Do travel plans apply to housing as well as commercial developments?  An effective way to make the roads more attractive to non-motorised users is the imposition of a 20mph speed limit in residential areas. Reducing the speed of motorised traffic makes it safer and less intimidating for residents to undertake short journeys on foot or bike and hence reduces the need for car use.	Policy 13 states that 'Transport Plans will be required for all major development' - this will include major housing developments.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01537</a>	Policy 13	Comment	Generally supported, however, it fails to recognise the Kidderminster Eastern Relief Road as a benefit for transportation in the town and the wider District. Given the comments above relating to the development strategy, it is proposed that the Relief Road scheme can be delivered in its entirety over the longer term, however, should be properly planned for now. The policy should be updated accordingly.	Comments noted.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01561</a>	Policy 13	Comment	Purpose of this policy to encourage new developments to adopt more sustainable transport solutions than currently exist and address known issues related to the highways network.	Comments noted.
Wyre Forest	<a href="#">LPP01409</a>	Policy 13	Comment	Do travel plans apply to housing as well as	Policy 13 states that 'Transport Plans

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Green Party				commercial developments? (B)“Travel Plans will be required for all major developments. These must set out measures to reduce demand to travel by private cars and must seek to promote and support increased walking, cycling and public transport use for a range of trip purposes through agreed targets and monitoring arrangements”. An effective way to make the roads more attractive to non-motorised users is the imposition of a 20mph speed limit in residential areas. Reducing the speed of motorised traffic makes it safer and less intimidating for residents to undertake short journeys on foot or bike and hence reduces the need for car use.	will be required for all major development’ - this will include major housing developments.
	<a href="#">LPPO2781</a>	Policy 13	Comment	<p>Improve access to Kidderminster town centre by establishing park and ride facilities and thereby improving air quality by reducing traffic volumes and toxic congestion.</p> <p>Accepting the probability that economic growth within the Wyre Forest will not be sufficient to sustain both the current and future demand for local employment there is and will be a need for workers to seek jobs outside the area. Encouraging them to use buses and trains rather than cars to travel to work would help to relieve the toxic congestion on the roads but the proposed transport infrastructure does little to address this objective. In fact the plan, because the parking facilities at Kidderminster</p>	Comments noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				Station cannot be extended, offers only a negative solution by suggesting that people drive their cars to Blakedown to connect with the train services emanating from there! Such a proposal highlights yet another flaw in the logic underpinning this Plan. If Blakedown has the capacity to handle an expansion of train usage why is no consideration made to use Blakedown for potential residential expansion. It has good links to Bromsgrove/Worcester by road and Stourbridge/Kidderminster and Birmingham by rail.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3427</a>	Facilities	Comment	Monies spent on revamping the train station are a waste of time. The station although unattractive, is perfectly serviceable. London Midland is closing down ticket offices. What the station needs is FREE car parking. This would reduce impact on residents such as I who regularly have train commuters parking up and down the rear of my property (sometimes blocking my car on my drive) or the incessant football supporters parking up Chester Rd South on both sides of that busy A road. Another problem the Council seem happy to ignore.	Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council fundamentally disagrees with the view that investment in Kidderminster Station is a waste of time. The station is in a poor state of repair and the quality of facilities is wholly inadequate to support growth. It is for this reason that a number of funding bodies have released funding to enable Worcestershire County Council to pursue this major scheme to rebuild Kidderminster Station. Your comments on free car parking are noted, however, this is not within the County Council's control. Car parking charges are used by Train Operating Companies to cover the costs of

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					operating and maintaining car parks, which are surprisingly high. As a result, it is very unlikely that free car parking will be provided at Kidderminster Station, unless this was part of a Government funded initiative.
Ramblers Association	<a href="#">LPPO4136</a>	Policy 13	Comment	<p>Ramblers is particularly pleased to see the emphasis on provision for cyclists and walkers contained in this policy. Sadly, we fear that these fine sentiments will not be followed through in implementation without a considerable change of mind on behalf of the councillors and officers involved.</p> <p>Paragraph B of the policy deals with Travel Plans and we would like to see these documents considering the public rights of way network and how it could be improved to facilitate journeys to work, shops, community facilities and education establishments. This should be followed up with obligations or CIL contributions to achieve improvements. We think Paragraphs 13, 32 to 13.34 which deal with active travel modes should be amended to reflect this aspiration.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council's ambition to pursue increased investment in active travel modes is set out in the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan LTP4, which can be downloaded here: <a href="http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/LTP">www.worcestershire.gov.uk/LTP</a>. Please rest assured that there is strong desire to invest in these modes; the challenge is a lack of funding, as a result of prolonged Government austerity, and an unfunded national Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, sadly. Worcestershire County Council continues to lobby Government with partner authorities for funding to be specifically allocated to support development of infrastructure and services to support active travel modes, as evidence proves that this is</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					sorely needed to tackle congestion and enable sustainable economic and development growth.
	<a href="#">LPP04468</a>	Congestion and alternatives	Comment	<p>Churchill &amp; Blakedown Neighbourhood Plan identifies Traffic and Transport as a major issue/problem.</p> <p>A456 through Hagley already suffers severe congestion up to the A491.</p> <p>Concern at increased use of Blakedown Railway Station without infrastructure improvements – parking already a problem and junction improvements required to A456/Station Road as well as pedestrian safety, e.g. additional crossing required.</p> <p>Even the proposed Eastern Relief Road will not assist – it will simply funnel more traffic onto the A456.</p> <p>Support increased parking provision at Kidderminster Station – why not build a multi storey car park?</p>	<p>Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council is well aware of the capacity constraints on the A456, and is working with partner Local and Regional Transport Authorities to make the case for strategic investment in this regionally important transport corridor. LTP4 includes Scheme WFST5, which proposes a major scheme to invest in Blakedown Railway Station, to significantly improve the quality of services and facilities provided there. At this stage, until the quantum and location of planned development is clarified within this plan, it is not yet possible to state what facilitative transport infrastructure will be required to enable and support this growth. Worcestershire County Council will work with Wyre Forest District Council to assess the likely transport impacts of planned growth and identify required investment in</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					<p>transport infrastructure and services to mitigate this.</p> <p>The case for a multi-storey car park at Kidderminster will be explored, however, given the exceptionally high cost of this proposal, and the need for the local highway network to provide suitable access to accommodate increased vehicular trips that an expanded car park would generate, this is unlikely to be delivered in the short to medium term (5-10 years).</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO5098</a>	Policy 13	Comment	Policy 13 on Public Transport needs to recognise the appalling bus services which we have at the moment and I feel that we should go back to municipally owned, supported and operated bus services. In an ideal world, the three towns could be connected by a tram system.	Neither Wyre Forest District Council nor Worcestershire County Council have much in the way of control in the provision of local bus networks, as these are now predominantly provided commercially. There remains a strong desire to see investment in local bus networks, but this will require Government funding to support such an initiative, as local funding is now scarce as a result of prolonged austerity.
	<a href="#">LPPO374</a>	Policy 13	Object	Any development as far out as Far Forest negates all the measures to promote efficient use of transport,	Comments are noted. However, there is a local housing need in Far Forest

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				and walking and cycling, because it will just create commuter miles in private cars while travelling to work in the major towns and West Midlands.	which we are trying to meet with a small amount of housing.
	<a href="#">LPPO3617</a>	Policy 13	Object	<p>If we take a look at public transport in the Kidderminster area it is by the by not too bad. Sadly the lack of parking for public transport is shocking. I would like to draw attention to the parking at Kidderminster rail station. Although there has been funds found to upgrade the station, during a pop up event to promote this, one question was constantly asked. “Are there going to be more car park spaces?” To which the reply was always “No”. Surely this needs to be looked into again as the Local Plan states there are going to be more housing so why can’t proper facilities be provided for ever expanding rail travel.</p> <p>Currently if you want to travel on the train and drive to the station, if you’re not there before 9.30 then there are no available places for you to park. A lot of commuters currently Park on the Severn Valley Railway car park as this is cheaper by day and sometimes the only available option. What’s going to happen when all these spaces are used and no more parking is available? Also currently people are travelling from the Kidderminster area to Stourbridge Junction station and using their facilities. Reason being as parking is free. The problem being that</p>	Objection and comments noted. The ability to expand Kidderminster Station Car Park is limited by available space. The case for a multi-storey car park at Kidderminster will be explored, however, given the exceptionally high cost of this proposal, and the need for the local highway network to provide suitable access to accommodate increased vehicular trips that an expanded car park would generate, this is unlikely to be delivered in the short to medium term (5-10 years). The reality is that, contrary to public expectation, car parking is very expensive to provide. Train Operating Companies charge for car parking, because this ensures that at least some of the costs of providing car parking are borne by drivers using it, rather than those who access the station by other means. In recognition of this, it is critically important that investment is now

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Stourbridge junction rail station also suffers from lack of or non-existent car parking spaces after 9.30. I feel that before too much money is spent on Kidderminster rail station the one major problem should be clearly looked into. Lack of parking spaces!</p> <p>On occasions when I can get the train to work; I still end up having to drive into Birmingham due to the lack of parking spaces. How can this be environmentally friendly? Also on many occasions during time off I have wanted to go into Birmingham or Worcester to do some shopping. Once again I have had to drive to these destinations due to lack of parking spaces at Kidderminster. Regarding trips to Birmingham, I had tried spaces at Kidderminster, Blakedown, Stourbridge Junction and Cradley Heath before giving up and driving into the city.</p> <p>How can rail transport be promoted with the expanded population as promoted in the WFDC Local Plan if a simple service like parking spaces can't be provided?</p> <p>Where are all the extra cars going to park with all the extra houses that are going to be built?</p> <p>The expansion of Kidderminster rail station is a bit shambolic and again needs looking into. Not just to promote the use of rail transport, but as an</p>	<p>prioritised to ensure that those that live locally to the station (i.e. within Kidderminster) have the option available to access the station without a car; either on foot, by bike, on bus or by taxi for example. The expansion of Kidderminster Rail Station has not yet commenced, so it is perhaps premature to suggest it is shambolic?</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				environmental issue to take all these extra cars that are going to clog up Kidderminster roads off them and people onto the rail network!	
	<a href="#">LPPO285</a>	Policy 13 (F)	Support	I support the proposed 'Dowles Link' WFST3 to connect Bewdley with the Wyre Forest. Access to the Forest is currently difficult and dangerous by foot or cycle, and almost impossible for those with mobility impairment, unless using a car. A safe and fully accessible link would not only enable people to enjoy the beauties of the Forest without resorting to a vehicle, but encourage a healthier lifestyle. This would fit in well with other aspirations of the Local Plan, to reduce obesity and encourage people to walk and cycle more. It would also help meet the need to provide equal opportunities for those with mobility and/or other impairments. A recent Feasibility Study has shown the viability of this proposal and it would be good to see this being taken forward in the near future. It would without doubt also provide economic benefits as it would attract people to Bewdley who would otherwise need to use their cars to access the attractions of the Wyre Forest.	Support and comments noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO855</a>	Policy 13	Support	Support proposals to improve the poor links of Bewdley with/to the Kidderminster Rail station.  Support any improvement of links especially pedestrian, between the SVR and Bewdley.	Support is noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
West Midland Safari Park	<a href="#">LPP01328</a>	Policy 13	Support	We support section D of Policy 13 which will give priority to improving infrastructure, technology and services to support active travel (walking and cycling) and passenger transport (bus, rail and community transport) during the plan period.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP03907</a>	Paragraph 13.1	Object	The statement is at odds with the proposal to increase urbanisation of the green field reducing quality of life and increasing pressure on the infrastructure inc health services and the local economy. I strongly object to the council's proposals.	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP0458</a>	13.2	Comment	<p>The Horsefair is an Air Quality Management Area. There will be an increase in traffic from the development at the rear of Baldwin Road OC/4. The increased amount of traffic would use Hurcott Road and the Horsefair to access the town centre and outlying shopping complexes.</p> <p>Roads around Hurcott Road would be used as rat runs.</p> <p>Baldwin Road is already a rat run that is used to avoid the Land Oak traffic lights. The A456 is gridlocked at times - during the rush hour, weekend and holiday traffic to West Midlands Safari Park. The increase in traffic would add to this congestion and would have an impact on air quality.</p> <p>Hurcott Lane is also used as a rat run and the access</p>	Comments are noted. Transport modelling is being undertaken as part of the next stage of plan-making. This work will help to inform the final site selection for the emerging Local Plan and what mitigation measures would need to be put in place.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				to the A456 is dangerous without having an increase in traffic	
	<a href="#">LPP0602</a>	13.2	Comment	Any development which would increase traffic in the AQM areas should be resisted.	Comment is noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPP0856</a>	13.2	Object	<p>Object to any proposal that exacerbates the air quality issues in Welch Gate.</p> <p>Concern with the further development of tourist facilities in the area and the enhanced role of WMSP, SVR, Wyre Forest, Bewdley etc. unless there is a proper and coordinated plan of traffic flow improvements. Without improvements, traffic through Kidderminster will bottleneck and destroy the tourism trade.</p>	<p>Objection and comments noted. It is critically important to understand that providing additional highway capacity will not resolve this issue, because the Wyre Forest is subject to significant latent demand. This means that any additional capacity provided would rapidly fill with traffic, leading to a net overall deterioration in traffic conditions. Recognising this, Worcestershire County Council, in partnership with a range of partner organisations, is focussed on providing enhanced travel choices, particularly rail, walking and cycling to reduce the need to travel and spread demand. This will improve access for all and tackle congestion in the Wyre Forest affordably and sustainably, supporting the long term socio-economic prosperity of the District.</p>
	<a href="#">LPP04554</a>	13.3	Comment	It is noted that attention is drawn in this paragraph to	Comments are noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				congestion in two areas, the A448 between Kidderminster and Bromsgrove and the A456 near the West Midlands Safari Park. In the case of the A448 between Kidderminster and Stone it is difficult to see how providing access for an additional 2600 new homes (potentially upwards of 4000 additional vehicles per day) proposed by Option A to this road is going to do anything other than significantly exacerbate the current congestion and pollution issues. Those of us who live near the A448 already suffer with significant noise and pollution from this road.	
	<a href="#">LPO4618</a>	13.3	Comment	In relation to infrastructure and traffic levels, the plan states that the West Midlands Safari Park suffers from high levels of traffic in the summer months, when visitor numbers are highest, WFDC has already approved the development of a water park at the Safari Park, on Green Belt, that will add to this traffic without providing adequate mitigation.	Comments are noted. Transport modelling is being undertaken as part of the next stage of plan-making. This will test the road network and inform the final selection of sites.
	<a href="#">LPO3909</a>	Paragraph 13.3	Object	The ring road is vital asset to support the movement of goods/services around Kidderminster. I object to the plans for further development.	Objection is noted.
Historic England	<a href="#">LPO1278</a>	Para 13.4	Comment	Paragraph 13.4 discusses the constraint of the narrow historic street pattern in Bewdley, are there any proposals to overcome this? We would be cautious of any approach that could impact the historic street pattern in Bewdley.	Comment on paragraph 13.4 noted.  The historic street pattern of central Bewdley lined by listed buildings restricts physical improvements to

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					<p>the existing road layout.</p> <p>Any revision to the existing traffic management measures is the responsibility of the Highways Authority (in this case Worcestershire County Council).</p> <p>There are no plans to make any changes to Bewdley's narrow historic street pattern. This recognises that much of the town centre is protected by Conservation Area designation.</p>
Canal & River Trust	<a href="#">LPP01015</a>	para.13.9	Comment	The Trust would in principle support the use of the canal to carry freight though this would largely depend on the extent required and maintenance implications for the waterway. If this option is pursued further discussions would be needed.	Comments are noted and paragraph 13.9 will be amended to remove reference to the movement of freight along the waterways.
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPP0903</a>	13.9	Comment	<p>It is stated that “The District's inland waterway network including the Staffordshire &amp; Worcestershire Canal and the Rivers Severn and Stour also offer longer term opportunities for the sustainable movement of freight through the District.”</p> <p>The Stour has to my knowledge never been navigable, with the exception of a short section that could be accessed from the canal at Pratt’s Wharf – see</p>	Comments are noted and paragraph 13.9 will be amended to remove reference to the movement of freight along the waterways.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/River_Stour,_Worcestershire">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/River_Stour,_Worcestershire</a> Navigation on the River Severn above Stourport stopped by 1900. Canoes and other small craft regularly use the entire length of the river from the Welsh border, but larger craft are currently at the mercy of highly variable water levels and no controlling authority upstream of the Gladder Brook confluence at Stourport.</p> <p>To make the River Stour and Severn navigable to the point that this would form reliable freight routes would inevitably require huge and ongoing investment that surely renders this non-viable?</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO359</a>	Paragraph 13.10, bullet point 2	Support	Integration of bus and rail (and the improvement of rural bus services) are key.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO4478</a>	13.11	Object	<p>The road network in Spennells is already congested. In Heronswood road, Captains Pool, and Spennells Valley road junctions.</p> <p>In addition many people use Spennells valley road as a rat run through.</p> <p>Additional traffic will increase risk of injury to children accessing the primary and secondary schools, cause pollution and add to health concerns.</p>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3910</a>	Paragraph	Object	The District does not have good rail connections to	Objection is noted.

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		13.11		Birmingham.	
	<a href="#">LPP04259</a>	13.12	Comment	<p>With three caravan sites between the top of New Road and the bottom of Sugars Lane, the amount of traffic up and down is horrendous.</p> <p>The school traffic is a nightmare, New Road becomes very congested.</p>	Comments are noted.
	<a href="#">LPP03094</a>	13.12 Traffic/Roads	Comment	<p>My concern is with the roads around any new development. We need to avoid creating more &amp; more congestion around Kidderminster.</p> <p>The Sugar Beet development is very good with improved access at both ends – Hoo Brook and the Stourport Road.</p> <p>But the development on Waterside and surroundings has built a load of houses, but only one way in or out – into the Horsefair. There should be another access road, say onto Crossley Park.</p> <p>Let's improve Hurcott Lane – wider, and better junctions onto the B'ham Road A 456 &amp; the Stourbridge Road A 451.</p> <p>At the Stourbridge Road end A451 this road could carry on down to the Wolverley cross roads on the</p>	Comments noted. It is widely recognised that there is direct link between development growth and traffic growth. Improving roads and junctions (by increasing their capacities) is not the answer, because this simply encourages more people to drive, and so congestion becomes worse. In order to tackle congestion, it is necessary to focus investment on providing increased travel choice, and reducing the need to travel in the first place. Ensuring high speed broadband access to all new homes, high quality walking and cycling links, improving access to rail and road-based passenger transport improvements can all assist in spreading demand, making more efficient use of local transport networks and mitigating the

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>A449. The Park Gate Junction is a problem already.</p> <p>These roads are used as a rat run anyway. Let's improve the roads and the junctions.</p>	transport impacts of development growth.
	<a href="#">LPPO3357</a>	13.12	Comment	<p>I write in respect of the implications for increased housing and economic growth within the Wyre Forest Development Plan on Hagley particularly on the A456, B4187 and A491.</p> <p>Hagley (these roads and intersections) suffer from daily transient traffic as part of both travel to work between Worcestershire, Birmingham and the Black Country and social and leisure destinations. This is shown with queuing traffic regularly as far back as Hackman's Gate and Blakedown, with further queues experienced in Churchill. As the queue continues slowly through Hagley it enters into a recognised increasing air pollutant area as well as a formal AQMA.</p> <p>Further queues are experienced along the B4187 towards Pedmore, Oldswinford towards Lye, Stourbridge and beyond.</p> <p>The A456 traffic continues beyond towards Halesowen in particular Manor Way and Gorsty Hill.</p> <p>The A456 is the busiest 'A' road in Worcestershire</p>	<p>Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council is well aware of the capacity constraints on the A456, and is working with partner Local and Regional Transport Authorities to make the case for strategic investment in this regionally important transport corridor; both for road and rail (Stourbridge Line). There are a number of reasons that congestion has become so severe on the A456 corridor. In particular, it is important to state that the economy of the Wyre Forest is in transition. The town's former carpet industries have declined and so many residents have sought work in the West Midlands Conurbation. As part of this refreshed Wyre Forest Local Plan, provision is proposed to significantly improve local employment opportunities, supporting diversification and growth of the local economy, which will provide suitably</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>with a recent daily traffic count averaging over 13,000 vehicles. These include unlimited weight constraints on HGVs. The road is relatively narrow, single carriageway in each direction running through developed housing, dissecting Hagley into two and causing pedestrian (school and to the shopping area) significant problems and safety concerns.</p> <p>Adding further development on the source routes will add significant pressure on an already over stretched, under capacity major road intersection. Recent reports from Worcestershire County Highways confirmed that traffic flows along these routes have already increased by 5% over the last year.</p> <p>This route is of strategic importance between Worcestershire, Birmingham and the Black Country as to limit access between these growth centres would surely restrict unconstrained growth plans.</p> <p>I therefore call upon the three LEPs from these areas to come together with a holistic and viable transport and travel plan using growth funds and recently reported Government Grants to assist in such infrastructure upgrades.</p> <p>Travel to work data clearly shows that significant numbers of travel journeys are made towards</p>	<p>remunerated employment within the District, reducing the need to travel, and so demand to use the A456. The Wyre Forest District also suffers from access to rail, which leaves many commuters with no choice but to drive to access employment opportunities, exacerbating congestion issues on the A456 corridor. The LTP4 and Worcestershire Rail Investment Strategy include ambitious plans to invest in Kidderminster, Blakedown and Hartlebury Stations and rail services, to provide commuters with a realistic, attractive alternative to driving. Over time, this will reduce demand to drive along the A456, which has finite capacity.</p> <p>Your comments on free car parking are noted, however, this is not within the County Council's control. Car parking charges are used by Train Operating Companies to cover the costs of operating and maintaining car parks, which are surprisingly high. As a result, it is very unlikely that free car parking will be provided at either</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Birmingham and the Black Country with the M5/M40 being clear destinations with M6 and M42 being destinations slightly further a field.</p> <p>It makes perfect sense therefore that a link road MUST now be created to link up with the traffic Island at Fairfield which in turn gives ease of access to junction 4 at Bromsgrove.</p> <p>Further logic says that the link road should commence BEFORE Blakedown to relieve it too of transient traffic.</p> <p>I have been in touch with members of Blakedown Parish Council and they too are supportive of the need to take measures to alleviate transient traffic along its part of the A456.</p> <p>The rail link between Worcester (and other destinations which it serves) is under utilised and restricted by either pay to park or very limited parking facilities.</p> <p>Car parking should be free at all stations with greater capacity needed at both Kidderminster and Blakedown stations.</p>	Blakedown or Kidderminster Stations, unless this was part of a Government funded initiative.
	<a href="#">LPPO3553</a>	13.12	Object	Hagley suffer from daily transient traffic as part of both travel to work between Worcestershire,	Objection and comments noted. Worcestershire County Council is well

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Birmingham and the Black Country and social and leisure destinations. This is shown with queuing traffic regularly as far back as Hackman's Gate and Blakedown, with further queues experienced in Churchill. Adding further development on the source routes will add significant pressure on an already over stretched, under capacity major road intersection.</p> <p>It makes perfect sense therefore that a link road MUST now be created to link up with the traffic Island at Fairfield which in turn gives ease of access to junction 4 at Bromsgrove.</p> <p>Further logic says that the link road should commence BEFORE Blakedown to relieve it too of transient traffic.</p> <p>I have been in touch with members of Blakedown Parish Council and they too are supportive of the need to take measures to alleviate transient traffic along its part of the A456</p> <p>The rail link between Worcester (and other destinations which it serves) is under utilised and restricted by either pay to park or very limited parking facilities.</p> <p>Car parking should be free at all stations with greater</p>	<p>aware of the capacity constraints on the A456, and is working with partner Local and Regional Transport Authorities to make the case for strategic investment in this regionally important transport corridor; both for road and rail (Stourbridge Line). There are a number of reasons that congestion has become so severe on the A456 corridor. In particular, it is important to state that the economy of the Wyre Forest is in transition. The town's former carpet industries have declined, and so many residents have sought work in the West Midlands Conurbation. As part of this refreshed Wyre Forest Local Plan, provision is proposed to significantly improve local employment opportunities, supporting diversification and growth of the local economy, which will provide suitably remunerated employment within the District, reducing the need to travel, and so demand to use the A456. The Wyre Forest District also suffers from access to rail, which leaves many commuters with no choice but to drive to access employment</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				capacity needed at both Kidderminster and Blakedown stations.	<p>opportunities, exacerbating congestion issues on the A456 corridor. The LTP4 and Worcestershire Rail Investment Strategy include ambitious plans to invest in Kidderminster, Blakedown and Hartlebury Stations and rail services, to provide commuters with a realistic, attractive alternative to driving. Over time, this will reduce demand to drive along the A456, which has finite capacity.</p> <p>Your comments on free car parking are noted, however, this is not within the County Council's control. Car parking charges are used by Train Operating Companies to cover the costs of operating and maintaining car parks, which are surprisingly high. As a result, it is very unlikely that free car parking will be provided at either Blakedown or Kidderminster Stations, unless this was part of a Government funded initiative.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2941</a>	13.12 Option A - Spennells	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic has increased already on the estate.</li> <li>• The development would increase this further creating pollution and noise and increase</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				health problems.	
	<a href="#">LPP01702</a>	13.12 Plough Lane, Far Forest	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic increase/highway safety.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01708</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01719</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <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>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01726</a>	13.12 New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	Objects for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Already struggle with volume of traffic.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01731</a>	13.12 New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic already bad.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additional traffic will make accident inevitable.</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPPO1733</a>	13.12 New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	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> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO1735</a>	13.12 New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor visibility for drivers.</li> <li>More cars down the lane will have an effect on wildlife, the lane and residents.</li> <li>Road frequently congested.</li> <li>Buses and farming vehicles frequently use the road.</li> <li>Narrow exits onto Cleobury Road.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO1746</a>	13.12 Plough	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issues with access to the site.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		Lane, Far Forest BR/RO/4/6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cars always break the speed limit on the road accessing the lanes.</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPP01747</a>	13.12 Plough Lane, Far Forest BR/RO/4/6	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sewerage issues.</li> <li>Culvert blocks regularly.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01762</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Already congested at peak times.</li> <li>Residents struggle on/off their drives.</li> <li>Difficult to get out onto Cleobury Road.</li> <li>Difficult to pass parked cars.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01772</a>	13.12 New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate public transport.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01805</a>	13.12 Lickhill Road North LI/6/7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic on already busy road.</li> <li>Emissions from cars.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01820</a>	13.12 Burlish Crossing LI/5	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase in traffic - especially at peak times; affecting emergency services.</li> <li>Higher emissions - health risk.</li> <li>Concerned about access to the proposed site as road is already busy.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01821</a>	13.12 Burlish	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic and fumes get worse every year -</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		Crossing LI/5		<p>especially at peak times.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People use Burlish Crossing as a shortcut so more houses will lead to more traffic chaos.</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPPO1834</a>	13.12 Lickhill Road North LI/6/7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic already busy.</li> <li>• New housing estate will cause more problems.</li> <li>• One way system around Stourport.</li> <li>• Road is used as a rat run.</li> <li>• Why haven't we had a second bridge which was promised?</li> <li>• Most houses already have 2 or more cars - more houses mean more cars.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO1839</a>	13.12 LI/5	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only one bridge over river.</li> <li>• Traffic already an issue.</li> <li>• Green Belt Land should not be built on.</li> <li>• Protects from urban sprawl.</li> <li>• Inadequate infrastructure and services for new development.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO1841</a>	13.12 Option B - Rectory Lane AKR/15	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic is already bad.</li> <li>• Crossroads by the switch back are dangerous now.</li> <li>• Air quality would deteriorate further with more cars on the road.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP01867</a>	13.12 Pearl Lane/Rectory Lane AKR/14 & AKR/15	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Infrastructure struggles with traffic already without adding to it.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01900</a>	13.12 Burlish Crossing (LI/5), Lickhill Rd North (LI/6/7), Steatite Way (MI/6)	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development will increase traffic and parking.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01905</a>	13.12 Pearl Lane (AKR/14), Rectory Lane (AKR/15)	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There would be traffic chaos.</li> <li>Cause issues for emergency services.</li> <li>Weekend/holiday traffic already has a considerable impact on the road to the bridge, being a tourist area.</li> <li>The only way north from Areley Kings is across the bridge and no roads can be built to alleviate the problem.</li> <li>Traffic from the Rectory Lane development would be joining this same road making the situation worse.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01946</a>	13.12 East of Kidderminster	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All roads are extremely busy and to more than double the volume of traffic would be very dangerous.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP01955</a>	13.12 East of Kidderminster - Spennells	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road network would not cope with the extra volume of traffic.</li> <li>Bromsgrove Road is already congested regularly.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01966</a>	13.12 East of Kidderminster - OC4, OC5, OC6, OC13	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The estate is already used as a by-pass and more traffic will add to the dangers.</li> <li>The by-pass which has been suggested will never happen.</li> <li>More measures should be taken to reduce speeding traffic on the main roads.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP01989</a>	13.12 East of Kidderminster - Baldwin Road/Offmore/ Comberton	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Road already congested at rush hour.</li> <li>New road would be necessary if development went ahead including bridges - this would be costly.</li> <li>Would have affect on the environment if new roads were built.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP02177</a>	13.12 East of Kidderminster - Hurcott area	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Already traffic congestion, especially at peak times, as Hurcott Road is used as a rat run.</li> <li>New development will increase traffic, pollution and noise.</li> <li>Drivers already mount the pavement to negotiate traffic.</li> <li>Dangers in traffic will only get worse if new</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				development goes ahead.	
	<a href="#">LPP02322</a>	13.12 Option A - Spennells	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fears the development is purely to facilitate the building of a new ring road which has been turned down by central government previously.</li> <li>• Development by Spennells, resulting in a bypass, will increase traffic leading to more noise and emission levels.</li> <li>• This will affect the health of the local population.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP02595</a>	13.12	Object	<p>The recent traffic diversions as a result of works at St Anne’s Church have started me thinking about possible revised permanent arrangements in Bewdley to improve traffic management in the town centre, the general attractiveness of the built environment and the town’s economic performance.</p> <p>Confirmation that the fire station site is likely to become vacant together with proposals for a new car park on the old medical centre site open up possibilities that were not previously there. This could be the opportunity to significantly improve the management of traffic in Bewdley and improve access to the Load Street car park redevelopment site.</p>	Objection and comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>If the direction of traffic flow in the Load Street car park was reversed and a road constructed through it the many conflicting traffic movements which currently cause traffic to gridlock could be eliminated. It would also considerably improve road safety for pedestrians at these junctions. This method of traffic operation has previously been impractical due to the sharp right turn necessary outside the fire station. However use of part of the fire station land for a new road would resolve this issue by allowing the road to be constructed with a wider radius.</p> <p>The outcome would be that all traffic in the Kidderminster direction would be directed to use the new road as creating effectively a circulatory one way system in Bewdley town centre. As a sub-option, this could be accompanied by reintroducing one way traffic in High street which appeared to work satisfactorily during the church works. The heavy traffic that used Severnside South during that period would not exist because the large majority was using it on diversion from Load Street which would not be closed under the proposed arrangements.</p> <p>Introduction of a one way system might allow part of Load Street to have wider pavements (or even herringbone parking) and may facilitate full pedestrianisation of Load Street on either the north or south side of St Anne’s Church which would</p>	

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>dramatically improve the ambience of the town centre for visiting and shopping. The improved traffic flow at the Welch Gate/Dog Lane junction could also help resolve the air quality issue in Welch Gate. Adequate spaces for much needed coach parking could be incorporated. Current bus stops would be unaffected.</p> <p>There appears to be only one negative which is the narrow exit from the Load Street car park between the buildings previously occupied by Murray's Pharmacy and Barclay's Bank. However, this is no narrower than the highway around St Anne's Church and might be controlled by traffic lights incorporating a pedestrian phase which could also replace the traffic lights outside the Guildhall.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPP04584</a>	13.13	Comment	<p><b>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></p> <p>The Plan states 'The recent completion of the Hoobrook Link Road (opened Sept 2016) will help ease delays along the A451 Stourport Road corridor'</p> <p>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</p>	Comments noted. The County Council is monitoring the impact of the delivery of the Hoobrook Link Road on the local network. Evidence suggests that there has been a reduction in traffic passing through Stourport, but further monitoring is required to fully understand the impacts of investment before coming to a conclusion in this area. Please refer to the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan (LTP4) which sets out

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>gridlock on the A449 roundabout at its junction with Wilden Lane.</p> <p>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 is not resolved by a southern/eastern bypass.</p> <p>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'</p> <p>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</p>	<p>planned investment in transport infrastructure and services in the Wyre Forest to support growth. This can be viewed here:  <a href="http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/LTP">www.worcestershire.gov.uk/LTP</a> In addition, an important component of the refreshed Local Development Plan will be an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will set out required infrastructure (including transport) to enable planned development growth. This document will be prepared by Wyre Forest District Council and Worcestershire County Council in partnership with relevant transport service and infrastructure providers, and will include consideration of new highway infrastructure.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>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.</p> <p>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>	
	<a href="#">LPPO360</a>	Paragraph 13.15	Comment	Actually, what would improve connectivity for distant travel outside the district would be a service to Birmingham New Street, which was abandoned several years ago. The track infrastructure would easily allow this.	Comments are noted. However, rail service is the responsibility of Network Rail, not WFDC.
Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO1026</a>	paras. 13.15 - 13.28	Object	Blakedown Station is an important asset for village. Parking at station is an issue and has been discussed at length with County officers. An increase in parking provision requires improvements to road network - A4556 junction and weak bridge at bottom of Mill Lane. LTP4 mentions Parkway Station at Blakedown - large-scale development would not be welcome in village. Hodge Hill has been suggested and would need detailed study and discussion. Dispute suggestion that parking at Kidderminster is limited as overflow car park is not fully used. People object to	Objection and comments noted. To clarify, the LTP4 makes no mention of a Parkway station of Blakedown. Scheme WFST5 "Blakedown Rail Station Enhancement Scheme" proposes a major scheme to significantly improve the quality of facilities provided at this station. It is very likely that this will include a suitably sized station car park with obvious access improvements from

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				paying to park here whereas Blakedown is free. Multi-storey car park should be explored at Kidderminster.	the A456. Worcestershire County Council is pursuing a Masterplan for this station, to clarify what might be possible to improve facilities at this location, based on evidence. The results of this will be used to prepare business cases for funding to support locally desired investment in this important facility, as suggested. The case for a multi-storey car park at Kidderminster will be explored, however, given the exceptionally high cost of this proposal, and the need for the local highway network to provide suitable access to accommodate increased vehicular trips that an expanded car park would generate, this is unlikely to be delivered in the short to medium term (5-10 years).
	<a href="#">LPPO3699</a>	13.16	Object	<p>This evidence of the second busiest station with main peak to Birmingham indicates how residents already do not work in or use universities in Kidderminster but are employed in and commute to large cities.</p> <p>You freely admit that these new residents will commute out of the region.</p>	Objection is noted. The emerging Local Plan does propose to allocate employment sites. This would enable some people to live and work in Wyre Forest and not commute outside the District.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				This is further evidence that the house developments and increase in rail numbers who use the train is turning Kidderminster into a commuter town of large proportion without character, uniqueness, employment or soul.	
	<a href="#">LPPO3912</a>	Paragraph 13.16	Object	Kidderminster station does not need to be improved as this will not increase passenger numbers whereas Blakedown station does need to improve its potential service. I object strongly to the development proposals.	Objection and comments noted. Worcestershire County Council is currently pursuing major investment in the quality of facilities at Kidderminster Station, as the current facilities are dilapidated and inadequate to accommodate planned growth. Similarly, a major scheme will be developed for Blakedown Station, to significantly improve the quality of facilities provided there, to improve access and accommodate planned growth in rail use.
	<a href="#">LPPO3913</a>	Paragraph 13.17	Object	Kidderminster station does not need to be improved as this will not increase passenger numbers whereas Blakedown station does need to improve its potential service. I object strongly to the development proposals.	Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council is currently pursuing major investment in the quality of facilities at Kidderminster Station, as the current facilities are dilapidated and inadequate to accommodate planned growth. Similarly, a major scheme will be developed for Blakedown Station, to significantly improve the quality of facilities

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
					provided there, to improve access and accommodate planned growth in rail use.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPPO1412</a>	Para 13.18	Comment	“It is vital that investment go toward measures to enhance bus/rail integration and active mode improvements”. The recently publicised plan of the “new” station has no bus interchange. In reality there seems little commitment to enhanced bus/rail integration.	Comments noted. The need for bus/rail integration was explicitly considered as part of the Kidderminster Station Scheme. Following dialogue with local bus operators, there was a desire not to operate buses within the station forecourt, due to the impact this would have on journey time reliability. Instead, bus stopping facilities on Comberton Hill are being improved to provide enhanced interchange at this location.
Historic England	<a href="#">LPPO1279</a>	Para 13.18	Comment	Where schemes have been identified in paragraph 13.18 are there any impacts for the historic environment? If so, how are they being incorporated into the schemes and the Local Plan?	Comment on paragraph 13.8 noted.  The proposed enhancements to the rail station and its access have no direct impact on heritage assets.  Where transport schemes are identified and brought forward for delivery, consideration of potential impact on the historic environment is fully embedded within our scheme development processes.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">LPPO1318</a>	Para13.18	Comment	“It is vital that investment go toward measures to enhance bus/rail integration and active mode improvements”. The recently publicised plan of the new station has no bus interchange. In reality there seems little commitment to enhanced bus/rail integration.	Neither Wyre Forest District Council nor Worcestershire County Council have much in the way of control in the provision of local bus networks, as these are now predominantly provided commercially. There remains a strong desire to see investment in local bus networks, but this will require Government funding to support such an initiative, as local funding is now scarce as a result of prolonged austerity.
	<a href="#">LPPO3914</a>	Paragraph 13.18	Object	Kidderminster station does not need to be improved as this will not increase passenger numbers whereas Blakedown station does need to improve its potential service. I object strongly to the development proposals.	Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council is currently pursuing major investment in the quality of facilities at Kidderminster Station, as the current facilities are dilapidated and inadequate to accommodate planned growth. Similarly, a major scheme will be developed for Blakedown Station, to significantly improve the quality of facilities provided there, to improve access and accommodate planned growth in rail use.
	<a href="#">LPPO3700</a>	13.18	Object	A large increase in train passengers to Birmingham as a result of already crowded trains.	Objection and comments noted. Any proposals for new railway stations will require a robust business case to

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>A new station is useless if there are insufficient trains to support.</p> <p>Again why is Blakedown not included in this plan for housing developments? It has the train and road links already in place.</p>	justify investment.
	<a href="#">LPPO3702</a>	13.19	Object	13.19 These are aspirations what evidence is there from commitment from the Rail providers, London Midland and Chiltern rail.	Comments noted. The Worcestershire Rail Investment Strategy is widely supported by all Train Operating Companies serving Worcestershire. Close partnership working with the rail industry continues to pursue the investment ambitions set out in that strategy, to the wider benefit of Worcestershire.
	<a href="#">LPPO3915</a>	Paragraph 13.19	Object	Kidderminster station does not need to be improved as this will not increase passenger numbers whereas Blakedown station does need to improve its potential service. I object strongly to the development proposals.	Objection and comments noted. Worcestershire County Council is currently pursuing major investment in the quality of facilities at Kidderminster Station, as the current facilities are dilapidated and inadequate to accommodate planned growth. Similarly, a major scheme will be developed for Blakedown Station, to significantly improve the quality of facilities provided there, to improve access and accommodate planned growth in rail use.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO3703</a>	13.21	Object	13.21 – Note that Blakedown train station improvements but no impact to Blakedown – again why are they excluded from the local plan proposals?  How can Blakedown benefit from monies into the region from Option A? There is no impact to them. This is completely undeserved.	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3916</a>	Paragraph 13.21	Support	I support the statements made within 13.21.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3917</a>	Paragraph 13.22	Support	I support the statements made within 13.21.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO4479</a>	13.23	Object	13.23 – Note that Blakedown train station improvements but no impact to Blakedown – again why are they excluded from the local plan proposals?  How can Blakedown benefit from monies into the region from Option A? There is no impact to them. This is completely un deserved. Do you have councillors based in Blakedown? There appears to be some questionable behaviour here.	Objection is noted.
West Midland Safari Park	<a href="#">LPPO1329</a>	Para 13.24	Comment	Paragraph 13.24 refers to the Severn Valley Railway as “one of the leading heritage railways in the UK”, and “one of the major tourist attractions in Worcestershire with over 200,000 visitors annually.” It also states that the potential exists to open up the line for commercial rail services. Potential exists to	Comments noted. This proposal is dependent on a suitably robust business case being generated to support investment, and the support of a number of partners in the rail industry. Worcestershire County

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				develop a halt along the line in this location to link the SVR to WMSP and allow visitors to the Park to arrive by rail. This is in the approved Masterplan and Planning Brief for the site, although the precise details of this halt would need to be agreed between the main stakeholders. This would increase the potential for sustainable access to the WMSP site. Consideration should be given to recognising this synergy between the District's two main tourist attractions and this should be recognised in the Policy and the supporting text.	Council is supportive of this proposal and recognises the potential benefits that this investment may deliver.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01373</a>	Paragraph 13.24	Comment	"Department of Transport" should be "Department for Transport".	Comment is noted.
	<a href="#">LPP0592</a>	13.24	Support	This potential should be actively pursued to reduce traffic & improve air quality in Bewdley.	Support and comment are noted.
South Worcestershire Authorities	<a href="#">LPP01247</a>	13.27	Comment	Paragraph 13.27 refers to Worcestershire Parkway rail station. Whilst there will be a substantial (500 spaces) amount of parking in this location, the SWCs consider that the focus for the Wyre Forest District Local Plan should be on improving the accessibility of and services to/from local stations within Wyre Forest District (set out at 13.28) rather than the current wording which places an emphasis on park and ride from Worcestershire Parkway which could	Comments noted and agreed.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				exacerbate congestion on routes such as the A449.	
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">LPP01320</a>	Para 13.29	Comment	There is much in this Local Plan about “sustainable transport” and having a comprehensive network of bus services using low or zero emission vehicles would make a significant contribution to reducing congestion. Paragraph 13.29 on bus services identifies many of the reasons for the decline in bus use. There must be a plan to improve bus services which is not to be blown off course by developers’ plans or further cuts in government grants. Alternatives should be examined such as the District Council running some services.	Comments are noted.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPP01413</a>	Para 13.29	Comment	There is much in this Local Plan about “sustainable transport” and having a comprehensive network of bus services using low or zero emission vehicles would make a significant contribution to reducing congestion. There <b>must</b> be a commitment towards improvement of bus services across the district.	Comments are noted.
	<a href="#">LPP0162</a>	13.29	Support	Lack of an evening public transport service and limited services of any sort to villages is having a severe affect upon businesses such as pubs and restaurants. Unless you live in one of the town centres that leaves few options for people to socialise in the evenings unless public transport can be improved. People living outside town centres and in rural locations are increasingly being socially excluded by the lack of public transport.	Support and comments are noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO412</a>	13.29 / 13.30	Comment	<p>The current bus network suffers from poor reliability not only "due to traffic congestion, lack of bus priority and poor interchange with Kidderminster Rail Station", but from a lack of commitment to sustainable forms of transport by WFDC and WCC. Bus services in the Wyre Forest are extremely poor. There needs to be a real desire by the councils to encourage residents out of their cars, by provision of high quality vehicles and efficient interconnecting services within and between the three towns. This will not be achieved without financial commitment.</p> <p>Small, electric, shuttle type buses as used in parts of Europe would be a real bonus in the town centres of Kidderminster, Stourport and Bewdley.</p>	Neither Wyre Forest District Council nor Worcestershire County Council have much in the way of control in the provision of local bus networks, as these are now predominantly provided commercially. There remains a strong desire to see investment in local bus networks, but this will require Government funding to support such an initiative, as local funding is now scarce as a result of prolonged austerity.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1231</a>	Paragraph 13.30	Comment	<p>The statement that "Kidderminster bus station ... has some shortcomings" is extremely vague. The plan should specify what these shortcomings are.</p> <p>This statement could be changed to:</p> <p>Kidderminster Bus Station is in private ownership (Hendersons), forming part of the Weavers Wharf development and is not widely utilised. The bus station is accessed via Corporation Street, and provides access directly into the town centre. Despite this facility being relatively well located, in recent years, local bus operators have increasingly forsaken</p>	Comments are noted and agreed.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>the bus station in favour of bus stops in the vicinity of Exchange Square, as this reduces dwell time and operating costs, as well as being more popular with bus users. As a result, presently the bus station is only lightly used.</p> <p>The proposed reopening of Worcester Street to through traffic is expected to further reduce demand to use the bus station, as new bus stops proposed in the location will enable 'through' bus services to avoid Kidderminster Ring Road, operating through the heart of the town centre instead.</p>	
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">LPP01321</a>	Para 13.32	Comment	<p>Active Travel Modes. After years when there was little provision for cyclists in the first few years of the new century there was progress in developing a network of safe cycle routes as well as better parking facilities. A significant development was the publication of the Wyre Forest Cycle Strategy in 2002 (<a href="http://www.wyreforestdc.gov.uk/media/107681/EB066WFDCCycleStrategy.pdf">http://www.wyreforestdc.gov.uk/media/107681/EB066WFDCCycleStrategy.pdf</a>). Part of the strategy was a network of cycle routes to which local cyclists had a significant input. Over the last few years the implementation of the complete network has slowed considerably. There needs to be some investment to complete the network but the benefits in terms of reduced congestion and better health make such an investment very cost effective.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is regrettable that investment in active travel networks in the Wyre Forest has slowed in recent years. This is sadly as a result of prolonged austerity, which has reduced available public funding to deliver such schemes. Ambition to deliver active travel enhancement schemes is higher than ever, and increased delivery will be pursued as and when Government funding is increased in this area.</p>
Wyre Forest	<a href="#">LPP01414</a>	Para 13.32	Comment	Active Travel Modes: After years when there was	Comments noted. It is regrettable

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Green Party				<p>little provision for cyclists in the first few years of the new century there was progress in developing a network of safe cycle routes as well as better parking facilities. A significant development was the publication of the Wyre Forest Cycle Strategy in 2002 (<a href="http://www.wyreforestdc.gov.uk/media/107681/EB066WFDCCycleStrategy.pdf">www.wyreforestdc.gov.uk/media/107681/EB066WFDCCycleStrategy.pdf</a>). Part of the strategy was a network of cycle routes to which local cyclists had a significant input. Over the last few years the implementation of the complete network has slowed considerably. There needs to be some investment to complete the network, but the benefits in terms of reduced congestion and better health make such an investment very cost effective.</p>	<p>that investment in active travel networks in the Wyre Forest has slowed in recent years. This is sadly as a result of prolonged austerity, which has reduced available public funding to deliver such schemes. Ambition to deliver active travel enhancement schemes is higher than ever, and increased delivery will be pursued as and when Government funding is increased in this area.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO286</a>	13.32	Support	<p>It is pleasing to see the aspiration to improve the situation for cyclists and encourage this from of transport for short journeys. The rapid rise in the availability and use of electric assist bicycles (1/3rd of all new bike sales in the UK are now electric assist) makes this a far more realistic and attractive proposition for a larger number of people who might otherwise rule out the bicycle as a means of transport. The Wyre Forest Cycle Forum has worked for many years, with some success, to try and achieve improvements in the cycling infrastructure. There is much more that can be done and the WFCF members would be pleased, and indeed keen, to help achieve such improvements.</p>	<p>Support and comments are noted.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPPO287</a>	13.34	Support	The rapid rise in the use of electric assist bicycles is making this mode of transport a more realistic and attractive option. It provides a great opportunity to make such aspirations a reality and considerations regarding development of cycling infrastructure should take great heed of this revolution in cycling technology and the fact that many more people will be attracted to cycling as a result.	Support and comments are noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1232</a>	Paragraph 13.35	Comment	The wording of the final bullet point is awkward. Suggest changing to: "To deliver transport schemes to accommodate development growth set out in the Local Plan and any subsequent windfall development."	Comment and suggested amendment is noted and agreed.
	<a href="#">LPPO3918</a>	Paragraph 13.37	Object	I object to the source of funding as being the mainstream of revenue.	Objection and comments noted. The County Council sources funding from a wide range of sources, including developer funding, to enable transport investment schemes to be brought forward. It is correct that ambition is often significantly greater than available funding, but without this ambition, we would deliver very little, so it is important that the County Council tries to deliver as much as possible, within the constraints of available funding.
Worcestershire	<a href="#">LPPO1233</a>	Paragraph	Comment	The final sentence should form part of the policy	Comment is noted and will be

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
County Council, Planning Economy & Performance		13.38		requirements of policy number 13 and should be moved into the policy itself and not form part of the reasoned justification.	considered.
	<a href="#">LPPO4731</a>	Section 13	Comment	<p>No idea on what Policy 13 means in practice. However, I would make the comment that the new Hoobrook Link Road has just moved the 'pinch point' back to the Worcester Road Island at Hoobrook and now there are delays down the A449 and Wilden Lane.</p> <p>I am surprised that when asked to comment on the options in the plan there is reference to an Eastern Relief Road. I cannot immediately find any reference in this section for the justification for this road. Presumably this is in another of the many documents mentioned in this section but, as it is clearly so important I would have thought that it might have been mentioned.</p> <p>I can see from this Section that although a lot is happening across the district and the rest of Worcestershire there is still a lot to be done especially if these additional dwellings are constructed. Where is the finance coming from for this? What happens to this plan if none of this comes to pass? Section 13.38 about developers taking this into consideration: I am sure most will say they have</p>	<p>Comments noted. The County Council is monitoring the impacts of the Hoobrook Link Road on the local network. Evidence suggests that there has been a reduction in traffic passing through Stourport, but further monitoring is required to fully understand the impacts of investment. At this stage, until the quantum and location of planned development is clarified within this plan, it is not yet possible to state what facilitative transport infrastructure will be required to enable and support this growth. Worcestershire County Council will work with Wyre Forest District Council to assess the likely transport impacts of planned growth and identify required investment in transport infrastructure and services to mitigate this.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>considered it, do nothing about it and expect local residents to live with the consequences. In fact the Company running the consultation about the land behind Baldwin Road implied that the dwellings would be for people who wanted to commute to Birmingham. Not sure how they will get through the traffic each day. Perhaps they will be able to park at Blakedown Station which I'm sure will be warmly welcomed by residents in that area!</p> <p>13.29 What is the proposal to increase the bus network within the area other than to switch the problem to charitable Community Transport.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPP04831</a>	Section 13	Comment	<p>In para 13.5 and 13.6 of this section it is stated that "significant changes in travel patterns and travel behaviour is necessary".</p> <p>At para 13.10 it is stated that for further development to take place it will be necessary to have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An efficient highway network with good links to the strategic highway network;</li> <li>• Excellent access to rail stations and improved rail services;</li> <li>• A convenient and efficient urban transport network;</li> <li>• High-quality active travel routes and</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted. Please refer to the Worcestershire Local Transport Plan (LTP4) which sets out planned investment in transport infrastructure and services in the Wyre Forest to support growth. This can be viewed here: <a href="http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/LTP">www.worcestershire.gov.uk/LTP</a> In addition, an important component of the refreshed Local Development Plan will be an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which will set out required infrastructure (including transport) to enable planned development growth. This document will be prepared by</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>corridors (walking and cycling) for shorter distance journeys, particularly in urban areas.</p> <p>However there appears in the Review few specific proposals as to how these aspirations will be delivered.</p> <p>Much play is made of the essential need for alternative modes of transport i.e. walking and cycleway. Yet is noticeable there is a complete absence of dedicated cycleway in the town at present.</p>	Wyre Forest District Council and Worcestershire County Council in partnership with relevant transport service and infrastructure providers.
	<a href="#">LPP04862</a>	Section 13	Comment	<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 halt on the dual carriageway at Hartlebury and then crawls the rest of the way. 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</p>	<p>Comments noted and, in the most part, agreed. It is widely recognised that there is direct link between development growth and traffic growth. Improving roads and junctions (by increasing their capacities) is not the answer, because this simply encourages more people to drive, and so congestion becomes worse. In order to tackle congestion, it is necessary to focus investment on providing increased travel choice, as you rightly suggest, and reducing the need to travel in the first place. Ensuring high speed broadband access to all new homes, high quality</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>queues along the A449 which was predictable.</p> <p>The review makes much of improving the road infrastructure but how can this be achieved without starting with a blank sheet when the present road layout is so restrictive, this comment being applicable to Kidderminster, Stourport and Bewdley.</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. Recently while on vacation in the Lake District, a known tourist area with narrow roads, local busses were used extensively as they were punctual with modern vehicles. Therefore if the service was improved perhaps more people would leave their cars at home, but unless something changes this will not happen.</p> <p><u>Train Service</u>: I have used the service to Birmingham at peak times and the number of passengers boarding at Kidderminster or Blakedown is very low. It is only when the train arrives at Stourbridge that it fills up and continues picking up more passengers until only standing room if left. Returning from Birmingham the trains are packed but by the time the train leaves Stourbridge there are relatively few</p>	<p>walking and cycling links, improving access to rail and road-based passenger transport improvements can all assist in spreading demand, making more efficient use of local transport networks and mitigating the transport impacts of development growth. Worcestershire County Council will work with Wyre Forest District Council to assess the likely transport impacts of planned growth and identify required investment in transport infrastructure and services to mitigate this.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>passengers remaining aboard.</p> <p>There is a reference in the review that the journey time from Kidderminster to Birmingham is too long having an average speed of 33mph. This is hardly surprising when you consider the number of stops and the number of passengers getting on or off the train. I fail to see how the journey time can be improved unless there are specific trains with fewer stops.</p> <p>Recently in the local press there were plans to develop Kidderminster Station yet it is accepted that there is inadequate parking and those wishing to travel by train should use the Hartlebury or Blakedown stations. This can hardly be environmentally friendly by putting more traffic onto already congested roads.</p> <p><u>Cycle ways:</u> There are comments that locals should use cycles more often or walk. Certainly there would be a benefit in reducing traffic congestion and improving the health. Unfortunately the roads are far too dangerous. Currently there are cycle lanes marked out on various roads which then stop as the road width is inadequate to accommodate powered vehicles and a cycle lane or they are inaccessible due to parked vehicles.</p>	

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><u>Car Parking</u>: With a significant increase in local population there will be a need for increased parking or a total rethink on public transport and vehicle free zones. It is very unlikely that this will result in a reduction in the number of cars on the road as freedom of travel is seen as being essential. Residents will need parking spaces for their vehicles, but it is noted in the review that priority will not be given to making parking spaces available on the proposed new developments by the statement "car parking provisions will be minimised". The end result will be vehicles left on footpaths leading to disputes. You only have to look at streets with older properties in the area where there is no facility for parking, this results in only one vehicle being able to pass at a given time.</p>	
Hagley Parish Council	<a href="#">LPPO774</a>	Transport and Accessibility in Wyre Forest District	Object	<p>Objection of Hagley Parish Council to new Wyre Forest Core Strategy.</p> <p>Hagley Parish Council adjoins Wyre Forest District and is thus highly interested in the adverse effects that the revised Core Strategy may have on Hagley.</p> <p>A description of A456:</p> <p>Parts of A456 are the busiest A-class road in Worcestershire. It passes through the village of Hagley, being a single carriageway road as far as the</p>	<p>Comments noted. Worcestershire County Council is well aware of the capacity constraints on the A456, and is working with partner Local and Regional Transport Authorities to make the case for strategic investment in this regionally important transport corridor; both for road and rail (Stourbridge Line). There are a number of reasons that congestion has become so severe on the A456 corridor. In particular, it is</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Hagley Island and then a dual carriageway, which subsequently becomes the Halesowen Bypass and then a link road (Manor Way) to M5 J3. The Quinton Expressway then links this to Hagley Road in Birmingham. This has for many centuries been the main route from mid-Wales, Bewdley, Stourport, and Kidderminster to Birmingham; before the canal port of Stourport was conceived, it was the route from Redstone Ferry (which was replaced by Stourport Bridge). The capacity of the road is grossly inadequate:</p> <p>Manor Lane: At the Grange Roundabout with A459 (and B4551), the Bromsgrove to Dudley main road. In the evening rush hour traffic daily backs up from that roundabout almost to (and sometimes on to) the Motorway Roundabout at M5 J3, 2km back. The last alterations carried out by Dudley MBC to this roundabout did not noticeably improve traffic flow in Manor Way. There is also a Birmingham-bound queue in the morning rush hour. One solution to this (though a very expensive one) would be an underpass at the Grange Island. The ground levels for this are suitable, but a considerable amount of property would have to be bought. The Highway Authority responsible is Dudley MBC, but they have little incentive to improve it as it is peripheral to their district.</p>	<p>important to state that the economy of the Wyre Forest is in transition. The town's former carpet industries have declined, and so many residents have sought work in the West Midlands Conurbation. As part of this refreshed Wyre Forest Local Plan, provision is proposed to significantly improve local employment opportunities, supporting diversification and growth of the local economy, which will provide suitably remunerated employment within the District, reducing the need to travel, and so demand to use the A456. The Wyre Forest District also suffers from access to rail, which leaves many commuters with no choice but to drive to access employment opportunities, exacerbating congestion issues on the A456 corridor. The LTP4 and Worcestershire Rail Investment Strategy include ambitious plans to invest in Kidderminster, Blakedown and Hartlebury Stations and rail services, to provide commuters with a realistic, attractive alternative to driving. Over time, this will reduce</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>A456 in West Hagley: Traffic using the road towards for Birmingham has to pass through a congested area in West Hagley – Kidderminster Road South, then Worcester Road, then Kidderminster Road. This is a single carriageway road, though mostly wide-enough for three lanes. It was formerly marked as such, but such marking went out of favour, because it encouraged head-on collisions between overtaking cars. This section of road has two sets of traffic lights, one at Cross Keys Garage and the other at the junction with B4187 (and Summervale Road and Western Road – “Summervale lights”). The need to pass through Hagley is the cause of severe congestion. This is not only at weekday rush hours, but also from holiday-makers on Sunday afternoons and the Fridays before Bank Holidays, going to or from mid-Wales. The east-bound queue regularly stretches back to Webbs Garden Centre, 650m before Cross Keys Lights, and sometimes on to the hill going up from Blakedown, about 1.5km back from those lights, also with queues of 500-600m on A450. The west-bound queue regularly stretches from the Summervale Lights almost back to the Hagley Island, 900m back. This used to cause long queues on A491, where traffic could not get on to the island, due to traffic that could not get off it, but that has been improved by the signalisation of the island. Problem of traffic queuing down the hill to the Summervale Lights remains, County Highways stated that the</p>	<p>demand to drive along the A456, which has finite capacity.</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council does not agree with the assertion that much of the village of Hagley is designated as an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). In fact, it is now proposed to revoke the AQMA in Hagley, because air quality has now improved to a point where it is within acceptable threshold levels.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>volume of traffic has grown worse in the last year or two.</p> <p>Much of A456 in Hagley is an Air Quality Management Area. Solution would be a link road or bypass, between A456 and A491, south of Hagley, providing an alternative route past the single-carriageway section of A456 through West Hagley.</p>	
	<a href="#">LPPO3412</a>	Option A	Object	<p>Greenfield development to east of town will increase existing traffic problems in Broadwaters, Horsefair, Comberton Road, Worcester Road. New roads do not help – they lead to an increase in traffic. Infrastructure needed to encourage walking/cycling/public transport – look at The Netherlands for ideas!!</p>	<p>Objection and comments are noted. Agree that there are some examples of good ideas in places like The Netherlands.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO3697</a>	Section 13	Object	<p>There are no references to increase in the number and frequency of trains required as a result of Option A from London Midland.</p> <p>A large increase in train passengers to Birmingham as a result of already crowded trains.</p> <p>A new station is useless if there are insufficient trains to support</p> <p>Again why is Blakedown not included in this plan? It has the train and road links already in place.</p>	<p>Objection is noted. We continue to consult with rail providers as we progress with the emerging Local Plan.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 13: TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPP04032</a>	13.7	Object	<p>“The recent completion of the Hoobrook Link Road (opened Sept 2016) will help ease delays along the A451 Stourport Road corridor and bring significant economic benefits to the area”</p> <p>I have yet to see any difference resulting from the Hoobrook Link Road. One possible reason is the lack of signposting at the island in Kidderminster where the bus depot is located. Stourport is still signposted along Stourport and not Worcester Road to access the link road. Drivers that do not know the area will naturally follow the signs for Stourport which miss out the link road completely.</p>	<p>Objection and comments noted. The County Council is monitoring the impacts of the Hoobrook Link Road on the local network. Evidence suggests that there has been a reduction in traffic passing through Stourport, but further monitoring is required to fully understand the impacts of investment. The County Council are exploring a revised signage strategy for this route, as suggested.</p>

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Sport England	<a href="#">LPPO213</a>	Policy 14	Comment	<p>GI by definition can include playing fields and outdoor sport. Is this policy designed to cover this, if so it should reference the Playing Pitch Strategy?</p> <p>It appears that playing fields will be covered by Policy 20C but Policy 14 does not cross ref. to this policy. It may be that a sports site might be regarded as a strategic sports site - is this meant to be captured by this policy?</p>	Comments are noted. Policy 20C covers green spaces for playing fields and outdoor sport. Policy 20C will be informed by the Playing Pitch Strategy. Note the suggestion of cross-reference between Policy 14 and Policy 20C – agree that this could be helpful and this suggestion will be considered as the policies are drafted further.
	<a href="#">LPPO312</a>	Policy 14	Comment	The draft plan, whilst promoting strategic Green infrastructure at Draft Policy 14, does not repeat the details of Adopted Policy SAL.UP3, nor specifically the proposed Stour Valley Country Park as shown on the adopted Proposals Map.	Comments are noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO587</a>	Policy 14	Comment	Green infrastructure should be protected especially where it forms a transitional zone between habitats. This applies to North and West of Bewdley where open farmland between forest and settlement boundary is under threat from developers.	Comments are noted.
Miller Homes	<a href="#">LPPO982</a>	Policy 14	Comment	Recognise that green infrastructure, <i>“the living network of green spaces, water and environmental systems in, around and beyond urban areas”</i> , is important to the principle of providing and enhancing green infrastructure networks. Welcome the inclusion of a ‘subject to	Comments noted. Further work will be undertaken on the GI evidence base as the emerging Local Plan progresses. The GI % target contributions for development on greenfield sites will be re-examined and the outcome will be fully justified in the

## LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>viability' clause in relation to the provision of green infrastructure in the context of proposed Policy 14 on the basis that the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that:</p> <p><i>“Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable”.</i></p> <p><i>1 Page 193 - WFDC Local Plan Review Preferred Options consultation document.</i></p> <p><i>2 NPPF Para 173.</i></p>	refinement of these policies.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1062</a>	Policy 14	Comment	We are pleased to support the intent of this policy and the weight it gives to protecting, enhancing	Comments are noted and welcomed. WFDC will engage and work collaboratively with

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
 INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>and, critically, managing the district’s GI network. However we would recommend some small amendments to provide greater clarity and offer a more robust policy framework in this area.</p> <p>We welcome the commentary provided in Sections A and B but we would recommend that you make clear that there are other elements of GI (small woodlands, significant wetland and other grasslands for example) that are also important components of the district’s network. It would be helpful to set this out on the policies map but for some smaller parcels it may prove more effective to cover this in policy wording instead. In this regard we welcome references to the Worcestershire GI Framework and Concept Statements and would be pleased to discuss how these might be used to inform decisions in the future.</p> <p>We welcome the intention to include specific targets for GI in Section C. but we query the levels set. We cannot find reference to an evidence base used to determine the figures and so we would recommend that these are re-examined in the light of the approach taken elsewhere in the county. In particular we note that the South Worcestershire Development Plan sets a figure of 40% GI (excluding private gardens) for sites over</p>	<p>WWT and the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership to refine Policy14 as the emerging Local Plan progresses. We will re-examine the GI % targets as suggested and ensure that a suitable evidence base is in place to justify fully the outcome of this work.</p>

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>1ha. We would strongly recommend that the same approach be taken here unless there are overriding planning reasons, demonstrated in the evidence base, meaning that this cannot be achieved.</p> <p>We are pleased to endorse the principle of early engagement in GI discussions set out in Section D and we would add to this the option of progressing GI Concept Statements for larger sites with the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership (WGIP). We would be happy to discuss this further with the council if that would be helpful. In the meantime we recommend that the policy draws specific attention to the WGIP and the potential it has to help with GI and collaborative working aimed at promoting more sustainable development in Worcestershire.</p>	
Stourport High School	<a href="#">LPPO1176</a>	Policy 14	Comment	<p>We have no particular objection to the requirements of Policy 14 – Strategic Green Infrastructure, requiring 35% GI provision on greenfield sites exceeding 1 hectare. The Council must, however, recognise the impact this will have on the capacity of the proposed allocations. The implications of this policy is that 35% of the gross development area will be immediately lost to green infrastructure provision. The provision of roads and associated infrastructure are likely to</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The GI % target contributions for development on greenfield sites will be re-examined and the outcome will be fully justified in the refinement of these policies.</p>

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				reduce the net developable area by a further 15%. If onsite provision is required for additional facilities such as schools, community facilities and other such uses, this will further reduce the net developable area. As a consequence, it is our view that the gross to net site ratio on each of the greenfield allocations will be 50% provision at best. This will have implications for the quantum development each site can deliver.	
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01234</a>	Policy 14	Comment	<p>The policy needs to be accompanied by a definition of green infrastructure, preferably the definition used in the Worcestershire GI Partnership. The policy also needs to clarify whether the policy will include gardens as part of the GI requirement. The standard GI approach in Worcestershire is to exclude gardens from assessment of GI on development sites because there is no certainty of their future management, limiting their GI value.</p> <p>We welcome the recognition and mapping of biodiversity assets (including priority habitats) as GI assets. We would advocate that the semi-natural habitats which connect these GI assets are also critically important in ensuring their conservation (as echoed in Paragraph 11.32). This would benefit from further clarification and</p>	Comments are noted and welcomed. WFDC will engage and work collaboratively with WCC and the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Partnership to refine Policy14 as the emerging Local Plan progresses. We will re-examine the GI % targets as suggested and ensure that a suitable evidence base is in place to justify fully the outcome of this work.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
 INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>greater weight in Policy 11D and Policy 14.</p> <p>We welcome the cross-referencing of Strategic GI Policy 14 within the contexts of Policy 11D, 27c (Diii) and 27E. We would encourage further cross-referencing within paragraphs addressing each of the key strategic development areas outlined earlier.</p> <p>Currently, Policy 14 (Clause D) encourages developers to agree with Wyre Forest District Council the Green Infrastructure 'matters' prior to application. It would be beneficial to make a clear reference to the services available through WGIP in this process. We would therefore welcome inclusion, within the reasoned justification for Policy 14 of Green Infrastructure Concept Plans where these are available and have been endorsed by Wyre Forest District Council. While the production of Green Infrastructure Concept Plans has historically been at the behest of each Local Planning Authority, as indicated in Paragraph 14.4, the GI Partnership welcomes collaborative working with developers in developing GI Concept Plans for key allocations and in achieving the aspirations for strategic GI as otherwise set out in Policy 14.</p> <p>In turn, WGIP will look to Wyre Forest District</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
 INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Council as both a GI Partner and key stakeholder in endorsing and/or adopting GI Concept Plans, and in the role of advocating with potential developers so that genuine engagement with GI Concept Plans is possible at the earliest possible stage.</p> <p>Part A states that "The existing green infrastructure network within the District will be shown on the Policies Map and will be safeguarded from inappropriate development". We welcome this statement and will work with WFDC to undertake the necessary analysis of the green infrastructure network to include on the policies map. This will necessarily be high level and more detailed work will be required to ensure that individual development proposals do not have an adverse impact on the green infrastructure network.</p> <p>Part C should aim to deliver 40% GI, notwithstanding site-by-site viability. 40% GI is an established, aspirational target for development across Worcestershire, whereby the capacity to deliver multifunctional GI and connectivity is maximised. For the standards in part C, there is also a need to specify whether this includes private gardens, communal spaces, etc. We understand that the figure of 35% was derived</p>	

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				from the viability assessment. However, in our comments on the viability assessment we have questioned the understanding of green infrastructure that underpins this assessment and hence, query the need for the 35%. Delivery of green infrastructure has always been subject to viability, as with all other proposals in the plan. We also have concerns about the justification of a 35% target and how this could be evidenced at an EIP.	
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01374</a>	Policy 14	Comment	Part D refers to "Worcestershire's" but it should be just "Worcestershire".	Comment noted. Amendment agreed.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01429</a>	Policy 14	Comment	No particular objection requiring 35% GI provision on greenfield sites exceeding 1 hectare. This will have effect on capacity of the proposed allocations. 35% of the gross development area will be immediately lost to green infrastructure provision, roads and associated infrastructure are likely to reduce the net developable area by a further 15%. If on-site provision is required for additional facilities such as schools, community facilities and other such uses, this will further reduce the net developable area. As a consequence, the gross to net site ratio on each of the greenfield allocations will be 50% provision at best. This will have implications for the quantum	Comments are noted. The GI % target contributions for development on greenfield sites will be re-examined and the outcome will be fully justified in the refinement of these policies.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>of development which each site can deliver.</p> <p>Important to ensure that the capacity of the allocations have been assessed on a realistic basis.</p>	
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01538</a>	Policy 14	Comment	Concern that this requirement will negatively impact upon a number of policies set out above, including housing land supply, density and viability. The inclusion of a specific percentage is too prescriptive and green infrastructure provision should be considered on a site by site basis.	Comments are noted and will be considered as we continue to refine Policy 14.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01563</a>	Policy 14	Comment	<p>Policy is not clear, due to the lack of evidence, as to where the figures for new development have been derived from. The numbers and location of new infrastructure must be proportionate to local evidence.</p> <p>Do not agree with the Council's current evidence as part of this policy and would expect that this is given further consideration prior to submission, to ensure that the evidence is proportionate and takes into account local data.</p>	Comments are noted. The evidence base for this policy will be reviewed as work progresses on the emerging Local Plan.
The Woodland Trust	<a href="#">LPP0528</a>	Policy 14	Object	We are disappointed that you do not seem to have taken on board the comments that we made at the issues and options stage on the need to have a strong policy on protection of existing trees and woods and on seeking opportunities for planting more trees and woods, particularly as	Objection and issues raised are noted. We will consider these suggestions and refine the GI policies as necessary.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
 INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>part of new development.</p> <p>We would have preferred to have seen a separate policy on trees and woods, given the range of social, economic and environmental benefits that they can provide and which we set out in some detail in our Issues and Options submission.</p> <p>In particular, we would like to see ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees given the strongest possible level of protection in your local plan. Ideally we would like to see a statement that these assets, being irreplaceable, should be protected in all but the most wholly exceptional circumstances. The need to protect ancient woodland and veteran trees is set out clearly in paragraph 118 of the NPPF and, by omitting any reference to these assets in your preferred options document, you run the risk of your new local plan not being in conformity with the NPPF. This is particularly concerning given that your existing development plan policies and site allocations document does contain references to the importance of ancient woodland and lists some important ancient woods within the district.</p> <p>The <b>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</b> also supports the need for more habitat creation by stating that: <i>Local planning authorities should:</i></p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><i>set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure', (DCLG, March 2012, para 114). Also para 117 states that: 'To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity, planning policies should:....promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan'.</i></p> <p>The <b>England Biodiversity Strategy which</b> makes it clear that expansion of priority habitats like native woodland remains a key aim - <i>'Priority action: Bring a greater proportion of our existing woodlands into sustainable management and expand the area of woodland in England', (Biodiversity 2020: A strategy for England's wildlife and ecosystems services, DEFRA 2011, p.26).</i></p> <p>A reading of these two policies in the National Planning Policy Framework together with the England Biodiversity Strategy indicates that habitat expansion, like native woodland creation, should form a high priority for this new Local Plan.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
 INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Research by the Woodland Trust shows that less than 17% of the population of England has access to local woodland within 500m of their home (vi) and this figure is the same for Wyre Forest. Recognising this, the Woodland Trust has developed the Woodland Access Standard (WASt) for public bodies and local authorities to aim for, encapsulated in our <i>Space for People</i> publication. We believe that the WASt can be an important policy tool complimenting other access standards used in delivering green infrastructure for health benefits.</p> <p>The WASt is complimentary to Natural England’s ANGST+ and is endorsed by Natural England (further details on <i>Space for People</i> can be provided on request). The Woodland Trust Woodland Access Standard recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>that no person should live more than 500m from at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 2ha in size</b></li> <li>- <b>that there should <u>also</u> be at least one area of accessible woodland of no less than 20ha within 4km (8km round-trip) of people’s homes.</b></li> </ul> <p>Providing more accessible trees, woods and green space for physical activity can therefore provide a</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>critical link to healthier lives and, consequently, to saving money.</p> <p>We would therefore like to see a policy point for green infrastructure to read ==</p> <p><b><i>“Protection, enhancement and creation of native woodland will be supported for the benefits it can bring to green infrastructure including for health &amp; wellbeing”.</i></b></p>	
Miller Homes	<a href="#">LPP0985</a>	Policy 14	Object	<p><b>Object</b> to the inclusion of the specific requirement for a 35% contribution from green field sites of greater than 1 hectare towards the provision, maintenance, improvement and connectivity of green infrastructure on the basis that the evidence base does not provide justification for this specific figure. This needs to be addressed on a site by site basis. It may be that a smaller proportion of land can create a more significant green link by design, and contribute better to the policy objectives via location within the site, additional planting and habitat creation, rather than an arbitrary percentage figure.</p> <p>The NPPF (3) makes it clear that each local planning authority should ensure that their Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence. The evidence base reporting</p>	Objection is noted. Further work will be undertaken on the GI evidence base as the emerging Local Plan progresses. The GI % target contributions for development on greenfield sites will be re-examined and the outcome will be fully justified in the refinement of these policies.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>relating to green infrastructure appears to be provided by the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Strategy 2013-2018, the Worcestershire Green Infrastructure Framework 4 (September 2014), the Wyre Forest District Council (WFDC) Green Infrastructure Strategy (October 2012) and the WFDC Green Infrastructure Study (January 2010). None of these four green infrastructure evidence reports identify and justify a specific contribution that new development should make towards the provision, maintenance, improvement and connectivity of green infrastructure. In addition, this specific 35% green infrastructure contribution requirement does not appear to have been explicitly tested within the WFDC Local Plan Viability Assessment (May 2017). Requests that it is made clear what the justification is for this specific contribution. If there is no evidenced justification then this requirement should not be included within the Local Plan. Further, there is no recognition that smaller quality green spaces in the right places can make a better green space contribution than larger area of land that do not fulfil the objective.</p> <p><i>3 NPPF Para 158.</i></p>	
Stanmore	<a href="#">LPP01514</a>	Policy 14	Object	Objection is made to Part C of this policy which	Objection is noted. The GI % target

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Properties Ltd		- Section C		<p>states that for greenfield sites of over 1 ha new development will be required to contribute 35% green infrastructure. Part D states this will be protected as semi natural 'green space.' There is no definition of what land can be included in Green Infrastructure but the implications throughout the plan are that residential garden land is not included and if this is the case it immediately leads to the loss of 35% of site area which is an unnecessarily inefficient use of land.</p> <p>In circumstances where land is needed to be released from Green Belt, it will lead to considerably more land having to be released than is necessary. Public open space must be provided on new sites and this will contribute towards green infrastructure so there is no justification for additional green infrastructure over and above what is necessary for the development.</p>	contributions for development on greenfield sites will be re-examined and the outcome will be fully justified in the refinement of these policies.
	<a href="#">LPPO311</a>	Policy 14	Support	Supports Policy 14 but asks for the specific inclusion of the Stour Valley Country Park, both in the text and in the Proposals Map.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3822</a>	Policy 14	Comment	The LPR lacks significant policies for such green infrastructure, as well as the more usual new 'walking and cycling' routes. It should consider at this stage opening up new green paths for access to such areas as Burlish Top and to Severn Way as well as providing secure cycle routes linked to	Comments and suggestions are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>national ones. A scheme to ensure development does not intrude into the sensitive rural, landscape of this western and north-western edge of Stourport would enhance the locality. Whatever development is proposed should have policies set out in this plan, so as to specify green infrastructure at the outline stages, with higher than normal arrangements than for 'average' landscape buffers for these sensitive but visually prominent north western and western edges.</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>	
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01235</a>	14.2	Comment	The first sentence of this paragraph states that "The District has a unique environment formed from different landscape character areas". It should be noted that landscape character areas only cover the rural parts of the district. The environment is also important in urban areas.	Comments and suggestions are noted.

### LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				In addition to the waterways, Wyre Forest and its landscape setting, plus other areas of woodland (e.g. Chaddesley Wood and Kingsford) offer opportunities for enhancing the currently fragmented areas of woodland that are a significant feature of the district's GI in need of better connectivity.	
	<a href="#">LPPO4732</a>	Policy 14	Comment	Let's hope that the words in this section are put into practice. At the moment I haven't noticed much green on the Silverwoods development.	Comments are noted.
Barratt Homes West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO775</a>	Policy 14	Comment	We have strong reservations to the requirements of Policy 14 – Strategic Green Infrastructure that requires 35% GI provision on greenfield sites exceeding 1 hectare. This will impact on site capacity. If 35% is used for Green Infrastructure and up to 15% for roads etc, then only 50% will be available for development. If schools and other facilities are required, this will reduce still further.	Comments are noted. The GI % target contributions for development on greenfield sites will be re-examined and the outcome will be fully justified in the refinement of these policies.
	<a href="#">LPPO3704</a>	Policy 14	Object	There are no guarantees that these areas will not be built over in the future as your plan will only encourage more house building for social housing. This is because once you start building on Green Belt as you propose to do, it will be a magnet for more as it will be easier to house social housing in Wyre Forest than elsewhere.  The Plan should consider using brownfield and	Objection is noted. Brownfield sites have been considered in the emerging Local Plan. Unfortunately, the issue is we don't have enough deliverable brownfield land left to accommodate all of our housing need for the district. We therefore have to consider allocating greenfield sites, some of which are located in the Green Belt. Agree that some residential use could be accommodated in

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 14: STRATEGIC GREEN  
 INFRASTRUCTURE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				building apartments in the town. This is currently what Birmingham and other towns do. It helps bring more life to the town and houses more people. Especially single occupants who make up the larger proportion of social housing need.	the town centre. We will consider this idea more as the Plan progresses.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Environment Agency	<a href="#">LPPO1065</a>	Policy 15A	Comment	<p>We note the recommendations set out in Table 4-7 of the WCS include “Using planning policy to require the 110l/person/day water consumption target permitted by National Planning Policy Guidance in water-stressed areas.”</p> <p>Paragraph 1.1.2 of the WCS acknowledges all site allocations are located within an area considered to be under 'moderate' water stress which could be used to justify the tighter ('optional') water efficiency standards in this instance i.e. beyond the minimum building regulation requirements.</p> <p>We note reference is made to the higher water efficiency targets within the reasoned justification to policy 15A (paragraph 15.6). However, in light of the above you may wish to include this within the policy itself. We appreciate you must demonstrate that there is both a need for the standards and show consideration of the viability implications of adopting the standards. DCLG study 2014 showed an additional cost of £0-9 per dwelling to achieve 110l/day.</p> <p>As outlined previously, we may be able to provide a separate summary document, including a location plan of each of the over abstracted wetlands and surface water catchments in the District, to help further inform the above.</p>	Comments are noted. The Water Cycle Study will be updated as the emerging Local Plan progresses. These comments will be considered during the update of the WCS and amendments made as necessary.
Worcestershire	<a href="#">LPPO1236</a>	Policy	Comment	Part (i) calls for develop that "Incorporates design features	Comments are noted. Agree that more

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
County Council, Planning Economy & Performance		15A		that will reduce water consumption". If this is to be included, more detail is needed on the level of reduction required if this is to be over and above existing Building Regulations. As part (ii) is not exclusive, everything in part (iii) would technically be covered by part (ii). However, there is a different emphasis in the two clauses which could be strengthened to benefit the policy and provide greater clarity.	detail is required for part (i) of Policy 15A. Parts (ii) and (iii) will also be strengthened and made clearer.  Policy wording has been amended to take into account these suggested changes. i.e. amended Policy 15A part (i) and merged (ii) and (iii). Added justification for 110l/p/d standard.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1539</a>	Policy 15A	Comment	Planning policies should not accelerate beyond requirements of building regulations, without evidence to support that requirements are deliverable and will not prevent the delivery of housing.	The additional costs of meeting this target have been assessed as being as little as £9 per dwelling (DCLG Housing Standards Review (Sept 2014) and is therefore not deemed to prevent the speedy delivery of housing.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">LPPO1181</a>	Policy 15B	Comment	We note that some proposed sites would require infrastructure and/or treatment upgrades or provision of new infrastructure.  We recommend should the findings of the WCS and the further assessment identify a need for phasing of delivery, this is referenced in the policy, perhaps in section iii.	The current wording in section iii provides sufficient grounds to ask for phasing. There is no need to be more specific, especially as not referring to the Water Cycle Study findings will provide more flexibility to take into account emerging information.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1540</a>	Policy 15B	Comment	No comments.	No comments have been made.
The Woodland Trust	<a href="#">LPPO529</a>	Policy 15B	Object	Policy 15b fails to mention the important role which trees and woods, planted in the right location, can play in	Objection is noted. However, disagree that trees should be mentioned in Policy

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>improving water quality.</p> <p>Trees trap and retain nutrients (such as phosphates and nitrates) and sediment in polluted run-off before it reaches rivers and streams.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They can also prevent spray drift of pesticides by providing a physical barrier between fields and watercourses.</li> <li>• Trees provide shade that is essential in helping prevent a rise in river temperatures and helping freshwater wildlife adapt to climate change.</li> </ul> <p>Trees can also provide a source of woody debris in rivers and streams which is beneficial for many species of plants, invertebrates and fish</p>	15B.
	<a href="#">LPPO1705</a>	Plough Lane, Far Forest	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change skyline – overlooking onto existing properties.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO1712</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate sewerage system.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO1723</a>	New Road,	Object	Objects on the following reasons:	Objection is noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
		Far Forest BR/RO/7		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sewerage inadequate.</li> </ul>	
	<a href="#">LPPO1736</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sewerage system inadequate.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO1771</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate sewerage system.</li> <li>Inadequate water system - low water pressure.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO908</a>	Policy 15C part i	Comment	It is my understanding that in line with the NPPF a Sequential Test will still need to be undertaken to demonstrate for sites at risk of flooding that there are no reasonable alternative sites available in areas at lesser risk of flooding. This Sequential test should in my opinion form part of the Local Plan evidence base.	Agree with these comments. It is our intention to undertake a sequential flood risk assessment and this will form part of the evidence base for the emerging Local Plan.
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO909</a>	Policy 15C v)	Comment	'for' is missing before 'biodiversity benefits'	Agree. This will be amended.  ACTION – Make amendment as suggested to part (v) in Policy 15C.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning	<a href="#">LPPO1377</a>	Policy 15C	Comment	Should the second sentence in part (v) be amended to become "...appropriately landscaped <u>for</u> biodiversity benefits"?	Comment is noted. Agree that the word 'for' should be inserted into the sentence in part (v) of Policy 15C.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Economy & Performance					
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1541</a>	Policy 15C	Comment	No comments.	No comments necessary.
The Woodland Trust	<a href="#">LPPO530</a>	15C	Object	<p>Trees and woodland can reduce localised flooding and alleviate the effects of larger floods in a variety of ways, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water penetrates more deeply into the woodland soils (higher infiltration rates) leading to less surface run-off.</li> <li>• Trees, shrubs and large woody debris alongside rivers and streams and on floodplains act as a drag on flood waters, slowing down floods and increasing water storage.</li> <li>• Trees protect soil from erosion and reduce the sediment run-off, which help the passage of water in river channels, reducing the need for dredging.</li> <li>• The greater water use of trees can reduce the volume of flood water at source.</li> <li>• Trees slow the speed at which rain reaches the ground, with some rain evaporating into the atmosphere - even in winter native deciduous trees intercept up to 12% if rainfall.</li> </ul> <p>A joint Environment Agency/Forestry Commission publication <b><i>Woodland for Water: Woodland measures for meeting Water Framework objectives</i></b> states clearly that: <i>‘There is strong</i></p>	Objection is noted. We will consider these comments as Policy 15C is further refined.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><i>evidence to support woodland creation in appropriate locations to achieve water management and water quality objectives'</i> (Environment Agency, July 2011- <a href="http://www.forestry.gov.uk/fr/woodlandforwater">http://www.forestry.gov.uk/fr/woodlandforwater</a>)</p> <p>The Government's <b>Independent Panel on Forestry</b> (Defra, Final Report, July 2012) has emphasised this natural approach by stating that:</p> <p><i>'One of the many benefits of woods and trees is their ability to help us respond to a changing climate, better enabling us to adapt to future temperature increases. We know that trees, in the right places, help us to adapt to climate change by reducing surface water flooding; reducing ambient temperature through direct shade and evapo-transpiration; and by reducing building heating and air-conditioning demands</i></p>	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1066</a>	Policy 15C	Support	Support this policy, particularly bullet points iv and v.	Support is noted.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">LPPO1182</a>	Policy 15C	Support	We support inclusion of policy 15C. In accordance with paragraph 50 of the Flood Risk and Coastal Change section of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), we recommend section ii, fourth bullet point, not only makes reference to developments not increasing flood risk elsewhere but also includes reference to opportunities for reducing flood risk overall. We also advise that the	Support is noted and welcomed. Amendments will be made to Policy 15C and its reasoned justification as suggested. The local climate change guide will also be referenced to for

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				supporting text is amended in light of the above to acknowledge that whilst Policy 15C ensures individual developments do not increase the risk of flooding, it is also important that the cumulative impact of growth within the LPR does not increase the risk of flooding and where appropriate provides betterment. Opportunities to deliver flood risk management infrastructure to address the impacts of growth will therefore be sought as an integral part of implementing the LPR. We note the policy requires appropriate allowances for climate change to be used in Flood Risk Assessments (FRAs), referencing the latest Government's Climate Change Allowances Guidance. For completeness, to assist planners and developers we have produced a local Climate Change Guide which could be referenced in the policy instead.	completeness.  Note: Amended (iii) and made reference to EA's local Climate Change Guide.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1542</a>	Policy 15D	Comment	No comments.	No comments necessary.
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1067</a>	Policy 15D	Comment	We are pleased to support the intent of this policy and we welcome the weight it gives to the need for well designed SUDS. However we would recommend that the policy include specific mention of the presumption in favour of SUDS that are soft-engineered, multi-functional and biodiversity led. This is set out in paragraph 15.20 of the reasoned justification but it would offer improved clarity and robustness to the policy if it were included in the policy wording itself.	Comment is noted and agree that amendment should be made to the wording of Policy 15D to incorporate this suggestion.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO911</a>	Policy 15D vi)	Comment	<p>This policy section currently reads:</p> <p>“Design and construct the surface water drainage scheme so that the water quality of receiving water bodies, covered by the Water Framework Directive, are not adversely impacted, both during construction and when operational.”</p> <p>WFD covers more than just water quality and it is important to protect all water bodies, not just the ones covered by WFD, from the potential impact of surface water drainage schemes. I therefore would like to propose to alter this policy section to:</p> <p>“Design and construct the surface water drainage scheme so that the receiving water bodies, including but not limited to the ones covered by the Water Framework Directive, are not adversely impacted, both during construction and when operational.”</p>	Agree with this suggested change. Policy 15D will be updated to include this amendment.
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO914</a>	Policy 15D	Comment	<p>Add “vii) Include aboveground, green SuDS where possible to add to the Green Infrastructure and biodiversity of the area”</p> <p>This text was included in an earlier draft, so I’m not sure why it has been removed. I believe it is important to include this policy as aboveground, green SuDS provide so much more additional benefits than simply dealing with the runoff from the development. There are benefits for biodiversity, water quality and also amenity.</p>	Agree with suggestion. Policy 15D will be updated to include vii as suggested.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1375</a>	15.2	Comment	In the fourth bullet point, "affect" should be "effect".	Agree that this should be amended.
	<a href="#">LPPO3919</a>	15.2	Object	The phasing of the provision of 6000 dwellings will do nothing to alleviate the impact on the water issues.	Objection is noted. The Wyre Forest Water Cycle Study (2017) considers issues of water resources, wastewater and flood risk and forms a key part of the evidence base alongside the Wyre Forest Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2017). Both of these evidence base documents will be updated as the emerging Local Plan progresses.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1237</a>	15.6	Comment	The text here refers to Severn Trent Water's assumptions of increasing efficiency, but it is unclear how these relate to the proposed WFLP policy 15A. Will STW's anticipated reductions be achieved through national measures (e.g. Building Regulations), local measures (e.g. WFLP requirements) or simply by customer education and awareness about the need to use water more efficiently?	Comments are noted. Paragraph 15.6 to be deleted from reasoned justification.
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO904</a>	15.8	Comment	'borough' should read 'district'	Amendment agreed and will be actioned.  ACTION – In para 15.8 on page 98, change the word 'borough' to district'.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO905</a>	15.9	Comment	I agree that phasing development across the course of the plan will allow STW and other key infrastructure providers to incorporate necessary improvements into their delivery plans ensuring key infrastructure is in place in advance of development. I would very much welcome phasing all development across the course of the plan, progressively meeting the 5-year land supply requirement, to prevent that easy to develop sites will be developed first and the difficult sites (often Brownfield ones) will be left undeveloped.	Comments are noted.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1238</a>	15.12	Comment	We question whether "strategies" is the right word to begin the first sentence. "Measures" may be a more appropriate alternative.	Agree with this suggestion. "Strategies" will be changed to "measures".  ACTION – In para 15.12, page 98, change "strategies" to "measures" at the beginning of first sentence.
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO906</a>	15.12	Comment	This paragraph refers to the appropriate number of treatment stages. The 'number of treatment stages' is somewhat outdated and ambiguous. I would therefore prefer to replace this sentence 'In order to address surface water the appropriate number of treatment stages set out in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (2015) should be provided as part of the development' with:  "To protect the receiving water environment developers are required to set out how surface water from the development will be treated sufficiently, using the simple index approach included in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (2015)."	Agree with this suggestion. Paragraph 15.12 will be updated to reflect this change.  ACTION – update para 15.12 on page 98 as suggested.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 15: WATER MANAGEMENT**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
North Worcestershire Water Management	<a href="#">LPPO910</a>	15.16	Comment	Developments will also be required to make allowances for future development for example the hard surfacing of previously green areas such as gardens, in the design and capacity of drainage systems	Agree with suggested changes. Amendment will be made.
	<a href="#">LPPO461</a>	15.13	Comment	Watercourse on the Stone Hill North area has a high water table and in parts are water meadows. Are these areas going to remain and if so how do you intend to achieve adequate drainage within this area that allows the special habits for the local fauna and flora, indigenous insects, birds and animals?  What is to happen to the water Meadows around the Stone Hill North OC/13N proposed develop including the stream?	Comments are noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO459</a>	15.18	Comment	Land at the rear of Baldwin Road is considerably higher than the rest of the area. If this is covered with concrete and tarmac where will the excess surface water drain to, especially in the event of a flash flood. The slope of the field could mean flooding in our gardens	Comments are noted. All new development will require a suitably designed drainage system in order to mitigate the risk of surface water and overland flooding both on and off the site.
	<a href="#">LPPO1727</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	Objects for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sewerage issues.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted. Infrastructure is a key issue that is being addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Further work on the IDP is in progress and ongoing discussions with the local water authorities are being had as part of this process.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Canal & River Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1016</a>	Policy 16A	Comment	Land stability is a material planning consideration (paras. 120-121 NPPF plus detail in NPPG). Planning system has a role to play in minimising risk and effects of land stability. NPPF is clear that planning decisions should ensure new development is appropriate for its location and that a site is suitable for its new uses taking account of ground conditions and land instability. This should be clearly reflected in this policy.	Comments are noted. We will refine Policy 16A to make it clearer the importance of land stability.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">LPPO1188</a>	Policy 16A and site allocations	Comment	Potential site allocations should be assessed with regards to previous use. FPH/1 Settling Ponds is partly on a historic landfill site as is LI/6/7 Lickhill Road. We would expect a review of groundwater vulnerability and SPZs (particularly SPZ1) and information on Water Framework Directive to inform selection.	Comments are noted. Site FPH/1 was included in the Preferred Options Plan but further consideration of this site is required as the Plan progresses. The final site selection will be made available at Pre-Submission stage.
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	<a href="#">LPPO1210</a>	Policy 16A	Comment	On matters of pollution, and subject to response from WRS, there may be an opportunity to identify possible methods of improving pollution (e.g. Electric charging points to facilitate electric cars, etc .....)	Comments are noted. The suggestion of 'electric charging points' is more appropriate for Policy 24B - Renewable and Low Carbon Energy.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1239</a>	Policy 16A	Comment	Pollution and land instability seem unrelated, so it is unclear why they have both been included in the same policy. Part B refers to land contamination, which has obvious links to pollution, but land instability is a wholly distinct issue and including it here does not seem appropriate.	Comments are noted. The NPPF refers to pollution and land instability together.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPPO1543</a>	Policy 16A	Comment	No comments.	No comment necessary.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
	<a href="#">LPO5106</a>	Pollution and air quality	Comment	If the general plan is to create improvements to air quality then the central area around the Town Hall should have been pedestrianised only, not dual purpose with cars and buses. As the car parking is limited, with many people resorting to using the car-parks at the supermarkets or Weavers Wharf, why is the use of Park and Ride not more widely used? Indeed Park and Ride with a full bus timetable created at strategic centres of population would enable and encourage people to avoid taking their cars into town and would establish a town centre free from toxic traffic congestion. This could be the first step towards the Government’s aim of eliminating petrol and diesel vehicles by 2040. Furthermore this would provide the opportunity to make our roads and cycle paths more receptive to walking or cycling in to town and eliminating especially the dangerous and unsavoury ring road underpass at the bottom of Comberton Hill.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPO1720</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	Objects on the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The road is a narrow road and if vehicles are parked this causes traffic to a halt, there is no area half way to top for this to be widened.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
The Coal Authority	<a href="#">LPO1028</a>	Policy 16A , para.16.21	Support	Wyre Forest's mining legacy is predominantly in SW of district where there is no major development proposed. Welcome acknowledgement at Para.16.21 that where development is proposed in areas with a	Support and comments are noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				known legacy of minerals extraction, the developer will be expected to assess the site for ground contamination, ground stability and mining hazards and submit appropriate mitigation reports in support of their planning application.	
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust	<a href="#">LPPO1068</a>	Policy 16A	Support	Support this policy and in particular the weight it gives to protecting biodiversity from pollution.	Support and comments are noted. Policy 16A will be refined further to include these suggested changes.
Environment Agency	<a href="#">LPPO1183</a>	Policy 16A	Support	The Wyre Forest district overlies a principal aquifer of regional strategic importance in terms of water supply and there are a number of Source Protection Zones (SPZs) to protect public water resources. With potential for contamination on brownfield sites we support remediation to reduce impact to controlled waters. Suggest that Section B could include reference to need for site investigation, remediation and validation to show that land contamination issues have been fully addressed. Supporting text should make reference to EA Groundwater Position Statements to help provide appropriate control measures, especially in SPZ1 areas. Suggest Worcestershire Regulatory Services is consulted in relation to human health considerations.	Support and comments are noted. Policy 16A will be refined further to include these suggested changes.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1241</a>	Policy 16B	Comment	We welcome the inclusion of Policy 16B (Minerals). To accord with the requirements of national policy and to assist in the implementation of this policy, we suggest some adjustments to the policy and supporting Reasoned	Comments are noted and welcomed. The suggested policy amendments will be considered as we progress with the Plan.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>Justification.</p> <p>Policy 16B could be strengthened by requiring applicants to assess the potential impacts on both mineral resources and minerals infrastructure. We suggest the following amendments to policy 16B to address this:</p> <p>"1. Proposed development in Minerals Consultation Areas will be required to assess <b>the potential for the proposed development to sterilise locally or nationally important mineral resources, or impact on the operation of permitted mineral sites or supporting infrastructure</b> <del>the scope for minerals extraction before development takes place.</del> Planning permission will not be granted for non-mineral development that would lead to the unnecessary sterilisation of mineral resources <b>or unacceptable impacts on the operation of permitted minerals sites or supporting infrastructure</b> within a Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) unless:</p> <p>a. The applicant can demonstrate that the mineral concerned is no longer of any value or potential value, <b>or the supporting infrastructure is no longer necessary;</b> or</p> <p><del>b. The mineral can be extracted satisfactorily prior to the development taking place; or</del></p> <p>e <b>b.</b> The development is of a temporary nature and can be completed and the site restored to a condition that</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>does not inhibit extraction within the timescale that the mineral is likely to be needed; <b>or</b></p> <p><b>c. Where sterilisation of a locally or nationally important mineral resource could occur, opportunities for extraction of the resource will be optimised;</b></p> <p><b>or</b></p> <p><b>d. Where permitted mineral sites or supporting infrastructure could be compromised, sufficient mitigation measures will be put in place to ensure their continued operation.</b></p> <p>2. Developers will be encouraged to recycle and reuse construction waste onsite and use substitute or secondary and recycled minerals within development."</p> <p>To support these changes, we would recommend including the following text within the Reasoned Justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development can "sterilise" mineral resources (make them inaccessible for potential extraction) or prejudice the operation of minerals sites and supporting infrastructure. This can be either directly, for example by building over land that contains minerals; or indirectly, for example though the introduction of sensitive</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>land uses in close proximity to these resources or sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In order that Worcestershire's limited natural resources are used prudently, planning applications within Mineral Consultation Areas should be accompanied by a Minerals Resource Assessment which evaluates how to optimise opportunities for extraction of any locally or nationally significant mineral resources. This should take a sequential approach to considering the following possible outcomes:</li> </ul> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Extracting all of the resource within the proposed development site and in the area which would potentially be sterilised by the development, either in advance of development taking place or in phases alongside the development;</li> <li>2. Where extracting all of the resource would prevent a suitable landform for subsequent development, consider whether a proportion of the resource could be extracted; or</li> </ol> <p>As a last resort if neither (1) nor (2) is possible, consider whether any opportunities exist for "incidental recovery of the mineral resource".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permitted mineral sites and the supporting infrastructure of existing potential storage, handling and transport sites are important to</li> </ul>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>delivering a steady and adequate supply of mineral resources in Worcestershire, and it is therefore important that they are not adversely impacted by sensitive or inappropriate development that would conflict with the use of sites identified for these purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different types of development may or may not conflict with the use of the mineral site or supporting infrastructure. The potential for conflict is a function of both the sensitivity of the land use or receptors at the proposed development and the techniques or processes employed at the minerals or infrastructure site. Applicants will need to assess whether the normal operation of the mineral site or supporting infrastructure could have adverse impacts on the proposed land use or any users of the proposed development. This should include consideration of issues such as (but not limited to) any noise, vibrations, dust, or fumes that may result from the normal operation of the site, and could lead to complaints which could jeopardise the continued operation of the mineral site or supporting infrastructure. Techniques such as considered design, site layout and landscaping or screening of the proposal may in some cases be adequate to mitigate any impacts.</li> </ul> <p>Footnote 11 in part 1 of Policy 16B refers to exempt</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>development. We support the concept of exempt development in order to avoid creating an unnecessary barrier to types of development which are unlikely to cause needless sterilisation of minerals, but we have some concerns over the definition included in Footnote 11. A number of exemptions were proposed in paragraph 8.4 of the recent Third Stage Consultation on the Minerals Local Plan. These have not yet been tested at examination but provide a more comprehensive list of exemptions. We would suggest that footnote 11 could include a caveat so that it reads: "Excluding 'exempt development', namely householder applications; development already allocated in the Local Plan; infilling in existing built-up areas; <b>or as defined in the Minerals Local Plan</b>".</p> <p>We also have a slight concern over "development already allocated in the Local Plan" being totally exempt from mineral safeguarding requirements. We consider that mineral safeguarding needs to be considered in the selection of sites, and it may be the case that some sites will need to consider mineral safeguarding and prior extraction but can still be allocated for future development. This is discussed further in relation to site allocations below.</p> <p>Worcestershire County Council is currently taking into account comments on the Third Stage Consultation on the Minerals Local Plan, including those from Wyre Forest</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>District Council. We would welcome continued engagement in developing the mineral safeguarding policies in the emerging plan and for these to align as closely as possible with the requirements in the Wyre Forest Local Plan.</p> <p>We were pleased to have the opportunity to provide comments at an early stage during informal consultation on the potential site options. The table at Appendix 1 highlights cross-over between minerals safeguarding considerations and the proposed site allocations.</p> <p><b>Coal</b></p> <p>Paragraph 16.19 refers to coal extraction. Whilst there are some coal deposits in the western parts of Wyre Forest, the Coal Authority no longer classifies these as a "surface coal resource" that is likely to attract further interest. However, former workings have left a legacy of mining features and hazards in parts of Wyre Forest district which are locally significant and may cause issues of land stability. We would recommend that you contact the Coal Authority to ensure you have the latest data, and that these areas are shown on the Proposals Map and referenced in the Reasoned Justification supporting policy 16A (Pollution and Land Instability).</p> <p><b>Mineral Resource Consultation Areas</b></p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>WCC (as the Minerals Planning Authority) is not seeking the removal, on safeguarding grounds, of those proposed WFLP sites that fall within the adopted MLP's Mineral Consultation Areas or the emerging MLP's proposed Mineral Resource Consultation Areas. Similarly, WCC does not require full extraction to take place ahead of any proposed development. Based on the assessed need for housing and employment land in Wyre Forest District, we believe that there is a strong argument that the need for the non-mineral development (housing and employment land) which needs to be provided through site allocations in the Local Plan is such that it outweighs the long-term economic value of the mineral resource.</p> <p>However, opportunities should still be optimised for partial extraction or incidental recovery of the resource, either in advance of development taking place or in phases alongside it.</p> <p>We consider that this requirement should be highlighted as part of the site allocation information and the exemption either removed from or amended in footnote 11 in Policy 16B. A minerals resource assessment should be required for all sites within Mineral Consultation Areas to inform design at outline planning stage. Consideration from the outset could offer opportunities to integrate partial extraction as part of ground works for footings, landscaping, SuDS schemes, integration of physical features and green infrastructure in the overall site</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>design.</p> <p><b>Mineral Infrastructure Consultation Areas</b></p> <p>The allocation of WFLP sites within the proposed Mineral Infrastructure Consultation Areas is not necessarily precluded, but consideration needs to be given as to whether the potential development would result in an unacceptable impact on the continued operation of the relevant supporting infrastructure or the successful restoration of the minerals site. Different types of development may or may not conflict with the use of the mineral site or supporting infrastructure. The potential for conflict is a function of both the sensitivity of the land use or receptors at the proposed non-exempt development and the techniques or processes employed at those sites.</p> <p>In considering whether to allocate WFLP sites within these consultation areas, we consider that Wyre Forest District Council will need to assess whether the normal operation of the mineral site or supporting infrastructure could have adverse impacts on the proposed land use or any users of the proposed development. This should include consideration of issues addressed in the Development Management policies of the draft Minerals Local Plan, including but not limited to any noise, vibrations, dust, or fumes that may result from the normal operation of the site, and could lead to</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>complaints which could jeopardise the continued operation of the mineral site or supporting infrastructure if potential impacts are not considered in advance.</p> <p>It may be possible to mitigate any potential impacts through measures such as considered design, site layout and landscaping or screening of the proposal. Any necessary measures could be set out as part of the site allocation policies. If mitigation measures would not be sufficient to prevent an unacceptable impact on the continued operation of the batching plant or the restoration of the minerals site, then the potential site should not be allocated.</p> <p>We would be happy to engage in further discussion on this as required.</p> <p><b>Potential Mineral Site Allocations</b></p> <p>Whilst none of the MLP potential site allocations overlap with the potential WFLP sites, some are in close proximity. We would welcome further discussion on how to resolve any potential issues of sterilising mineral resources or negatively impacting on potential mineral sites through the introduction of additional sensitive receptors in close proximity, as well as the potential impact of any mineral development on the potential housing/employment allocations.</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				However, depending on when these developments come forward, there may be potential for any mineral resources excavated during the development of these sites (as required for mineral safeguarding purposes) to be processed at these potential minerals sites, and/or for the minerals sites to supply building materials for the developments.	
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPP01387</a>	Policy 16B	Comment	<p>Intention to safeguard minerals in number of consultation areas is noted.</p> <p>Para.143 NPPF - LPAs should set out local plan policies to encourage prior extraction of minerals where practicable and feasible it is necessary for non-mineral development to take place. Gladman consider that this requirement needs to be balanced against competing development needs. A positively framed mineral safeguarding policy will therefore be required that enables the local planning authority to reach suitably balanced judgements on the positive or negative effects of a non-minerals development alongside other policy considerations contained within the local plan as a whole, including the emphasis to significantly boost the supply of housing and the spatial strategy that will shape the focus for this locally.</p>	Comments are noted.
Taylor Wimpey West Midlands	<a href="#">LPP01544</a>	Policy 16B	Comment	No comments.	No comments necessary.
Taylor Wimpey	<a href="#">LPP01545</a>	Policy 16C	Comment	No comments.	No comments necessary.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
West Midlands					
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1240</a>	Policy 16C	Support	<p>We fully support Policy 16C and the supporting Reasoned Justification in paragraphs 16.22 to 16.29.</p> <p><b>Safeguarding Waste Management Development</b></p> <p>There are a significant number of operational waste sites within Wyre Forest district. Some are seen as relatively low-value land uses and could therefore be vulnerable to redevelopment for other uses. Relocating a waste management operation can be difficult, therefore existing facilities should be safeguarded from development of non-waste related uses. Policy WCS 16 of the Waste Core Strategy seeks to safeguard these existing facilities and a web-map is available showing the sites and the 250m policy buffer around them:  <a href="http://gis.worcestershire.gov.uk/website/WasteCoreStrategy/">http://gis.worcestershire.gov.uk/website/WasteCoreStrategy/</a></p> <p>It is unlikely that this will be a significant factor in deciding between the two spatial options, but the relationship between the new and existing land uses should be considered before allocations are made or new permissions are granted. Any potential impacts should be considered in advance and included in any guidance on the design and development of the site allocations. This would mean that it will usually be possible to minimise conflict between the existing waste management facility</p>	Support for Policy 16C is noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				and the proposed development.	
	<a href="#">LPPO453</a>	16.3	Comment	Dust, light, noise, fumes and smell will have detrimental impacts on the environment and quality of life. This is relevant to all the options concerning the development to the East of Kidderminster	Comments are noted. Policy 16A is a specific policy for pollution. Pollution is a material planning consideration and development proposals must be designed in order to avoid any significant adverse impacts from pollution.
	<a href="#">LPPO3698</a>	16.3	Object	16.3 Pollution will increase as you build on Green Belt and field. You do not say how you propose to deal with the threat of increased pollution.	Objection is noted. Policy 16A is a specific policy for pollution. Pollution is a material planning consideration and development proposals must be designed in order to avoid any significant adverse impacts from pollution.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPPO1132</a>	16.6	Comment	This paragraph states that adoption of the new Minerals Local Plan for Worcestershire is anticipated in late 2018. Please note that a revised Minerals and Waste Local Development Scheme has been approved by Worcestershire County Council, and adoption of the Minerals Local Plan is now anticipated in spring 2020.	Comments are noted. The relevant text will be updated in paragraph 16.6.
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth	<a href="#">LPPO1322</a>	16.28	Support	WFFoE support this policy of larger sites having onsite waste treatment such as composting or anaerobic digestion as part of a district heating scheme.	Support for Policy 16C and para 16.28 is noted.
Wyre Forest Green Party	<a href="#">LPPO1471</a>	16.28	Support	We support this policy of larger sites having onsite waste treatment such as composting or anaerobic digestion as	Support for Policy 16C and para 16.28 is noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 16: POLLUTION MINERALS AND WASTE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para / Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				part of a district heating scheme.	
Historic England	<a href="#">LPPO1280</a>	Minerals	Comment	<p>On the section under Minerals, we would recommend including some information about the issues for the historic environment and the need to protect and conserve heritage assets, as a result of proposed minerals development. Undesignated archaeology can be a particular issue in minerals development. Historic England also has some advice regarding restoration of minerals sites and how it can be achieved to benefit the historic environment. We are currently preparing updated advice on minerals development and the historic environment and would be happy to share this with you when it is available.</p> <p>Additionally, we support minerals development, in appropriate locations, where local building stone is being mined that can be used for the repair of historic buildings.</p>	<p>Comment on minerals noted.</p> <p>Add a new section to Policy 16B 1d to read:</p> <p>"Restoration of minerals extraction sites which impact on heritage assets or their settings should be appropriate to the maintenance of and the significance of those assets".</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO1709</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic.</li> <li>• Pollution.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 18: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para/Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Wyre Forest District Council - Development Control	<a href="#">LPP01211</a>	Policy 18A	Comment	This isn't just about Affordable Housing, but rather it is about the wider potential S106 Obligations (e.g. Open space, education, etc ....). Many potential contributions could render a scheme unviable so, notwithstanding the previous policy wording, to restrict the policy to just affordable housing appears flawed.	This is specifically under a section regarding affordable housing requirements but will ensure consistency throughout the wider document regarding viability.
Persimmon Homes Limited	<a href="#">LPP01436</a>	Policy 18A and RJ	Object	Not appropriate for the Council to secure payment for viability assessments via a development plan policy. Council charges are the subject of separate legislation. Strongly object to the suggestion in paragraph 18.3 that the Council should obtain planning gain. There is no basis in national policy for this approach. Payments required of developers and landowners should only be sought as part of mitigation of any unacceptable impacts arising from development.	WFDC will follow the government's guidance on viability testing at plan stage and on s106 contributions and will update its planning policies once this has been published.
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance	<a href="#">LPP01244</a>	Policy 18B	Comment	This policy states that " <i>Small scale residential developments on infill plots within the settlement boundaries of the three main towns and the villages will be encouraged provided that they contribute to the existing character of the area in terms of design, density and layout</i> ". Infill proposals have the potential to harm the character and form of historic areas, and policies regarding infill development should be more specifically linked to policies that seek to preserve the existing character of an area, in order to avoid or minimise risk of conflict at an early stage in the planning process. Sub-sections (i) to (iv)	ADD POLICY 18B v.  v. Where proposals for infill development are sited within or adjacent to heritage assets, they must accord with Historic Environment Policies 11B and 26; also Policy 27A Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 18: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para/Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				of policy 18B contain no mention of conservation areas and historic character, etc. and would be better linked or referenced to policy 11B - Historic Environment. In particular, subsections A and B of policy 11B could be referenced, including items (i), (iii), (vi), (vii), (viii) and (ix), as well as policy 27A - Quality Design and Local Distinctiveness, subsections A and B including items (ii) and (iv).	Reasoned Justification:  18. Inappropriately sited and designed infill development has potential to harm the form, character and setting of Conservation Areas and other heritage assets.
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPPO1388</a>	Policy 18B	Comment	Note intention to enable residential infill development within settlement boundaries that will be set through Local Plan. Also consider that there are sustainable development opportunities adjacent to settlement boundaries. Plan needs to have flexibility built in to allow such sites to come forward if required to help with housing land supply.	Comments noted.
Bournewood Nurseries	<a href="#">LPPO1965</a>	Infill Development	Comment	It is noted that the current policy drafting stated an intention to enable residential infill development within defined settlement boundaries. Development boundaries are often tightly drawn around a settlement. The policy should include some flexibility and allowance for consideration of sites on their individual merits and also reflect the opportunities available through sites, such as Bournewood Nurseries, can still allow development in sustainable locations. Such flexibility would also allow the LPA to respond to changes required in housing supply across the plan period.	Comments noted. Settlement boundaries are being considered in Rock Parish as part of the Local Plan Review.
	<a href="#">LPPO2196</a>	Policy 18B	Comment	The wholesale 'garden land' restriction that has been	The garden land restriction is

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 18: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para/Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p>hitherto adopted by WFDC is a wholly inflexible and not tailored to the site in question. It has been applied on a 'blanket' basis.</p> <p>An infill proposal should be considered where it can be accommodated within the existing built environment and on its own merits.</p> <p>There are also infill plots available within the countryside/Green Belt that may be worthy of consideration to alleviate the pressure for quality housing to attract external residents to support and contribute to the local economy.</p> <p>There needs to be inward migration from the Birmingham area to improve social demographics all round and provide the ambient choice of housing and location.</p>	<p>being lifted allowing development on non PDL where it meets the infill policies.</p>
	<a href="#">LPPO2827</a>	Policy 18B	Comment	I do not object to this small scale residential development on infill plots.	Comments noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO2932</a>	Policy 18B	Object	<p>The Local Plan Review should have clearer and more ambitious policy objectives.</p> <p>NPPG indicates sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment. It would be appropriate to include 'gain' in policy 18B and its Reasoning Justification. Surely the Council wants more for its community beyond 'sufficient</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 18: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para/Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				separation’ and ‘satisfactory car parking’;	
	<a href="#">LPO625</a>	Policy 18B	Support	Support for Policy 18B - residential infill development.	Support is noted.
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPO857</a>	Policy 18B Residential Infill Development	Support	Support for Policy 18B.	Support is noted.
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">LPO1044</a>	Policy 18B	Support	We support this policy.	Support is noted.
Miller Homes	<a href="#">LPO986</a>	Policy 18C	Comment	<p>Space standards should be left to developers to determine in line with market requirements. Wish to reserve final comment on the appropriateness of introducing National Space Standards into the District as a policy requirement within the new Local Plan until the “further evidence” being gathered by Wyre Forest District Council (WFDC) to justify the inclusion of this Policy requirement, including an analysis of recently completed housing, has been undertaken to inform the next stage of Local Plan consultation.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states<sup>2</sup> that:</p> <p><i>“Local planning authorities should set out their policy on local standards in the Local Plan, including requirements for affordable housing. They should assess the likely cumulative impacts on development</i></p>	Comments noted and it is our intention for this policy to outline the specific case for WFDC.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 18: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para/Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				<p><i>in their area of all existing and proposed standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the development plan, when added to nationally required standards. In order to be appropriate, the cumulative impact of these standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should facilitate development throughout the economic cycle. Evidence supporting the assessment should be proportionate, using only appropriate available evidence”.</i></p> <p>The Housing Standards Review introduces a new national space standard, this has not been incorporated into the Building Standards and is not a requirement. National housebuilders have a vested interest in building products that meet market needs, which will sell and which are viable to build. The policies in the new Local Plan should be sufficiently flexible to allow this to happen without adding a prescriptive policy burden. If the market demands space standards in line with the optional national standards, then it is more likely that developers will deliver these. These considerations all form part of the need to take account of ‘market signals’, as required by the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF makes it clear that each local planning authority should ensure that their Local Plan is based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence. The</p>	

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 18: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para/Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				new Local Plan should therefore only require developers to meet the National Space Standards if WFDC can justify this requirement by taking account of need (evidence provided on the size and type of dwelling currently being built in the area), viability (consideration of the impact of adopting the space standards as part of the Plan’s viability assessment) and timing (potential need to factor in a reasonable transition period following adoption of a new policy on space standards to allow developers to factor this into future land acquisitions), in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)	
Gladman Developments Limited	<a href="#">LPO1389</a>	Policy 18C	Object	Concerned with proposed introduction of enhanced technical standards. Where is justification for this in terms of need, viability and impact on affordability? A local assessment must be provided to justify this policy.	Comments noted and it is our intention for this policy to outline the specific case for WFDC.
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council	<a href="#">LPO1043</a>	Policy 18C	Support	Pleased to see reference to national space standards	Support is noted.
Wyre Forest Community Housing	<a href="#">LPO1679</a>	Policy 18C	Support	We would support the District Council in deciding whether the Nationally Described Space Standards apply to all new homes or to none.  Our own work relating to standard house types broadly adopted the approach of meeting Building Regulations 2010 Requirement M4 (1): Category 1 - Visitable Dwellings.	Comments noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 18: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para/Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO858</a>	Policy 18D Flat Conversions	Support	Support for Policy 18D.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3705</a>	Policy 18E	Object	<p>18 E You describe what you see as an acute housing shortage in the region and demand for housing. However please see comments as to why this is disputed.</p> <p>However it appears that the need for mobile homes and holiday homes overrides this requirement. You quote that they are temporary in nature but there are many very large permanent mobile home parks with year round use in Stourport. Lickhill manor, 65 acres Severnside.</p> <p>Your plan is contradictory in nature.</p>	<p>The identified need for housing has been undertaken through a standard approach to assessing housing needs and so we are satisfied we can demonstrate a need for housing. Please see the technical evidence base.</p> <p>The caravan parks within Wyre Forest are temporary with two exceptions; Kinverdale and Severn Bank.</p>
Bewdley Civic Society	<a href="#">LPPO859</a>	Policy 18E Residential Caravans and Mobile Homes	Support	Qualified support. The policy should allow caravans/chalets for personal circumstances as annex accommodation. Their standard of construction in not necessarily inferior.	Support noted.
Campaign to Protect Rural England	<a href="#">LPPO940</a>	Policy 18E	Support	much stronger wording than previously in Core Strategy. Policy should be expanded to cover existing mobile home/caravan sites with 11 month occupancy and cross referenced to 23C and 28B.	The policy is the same as the SAAP it will apply to new developments and not existing.
	<a href="#">LPPO1704</a>	Plough Lane, Far Forest	Object	<p>Objects on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Change skyline – overlooking onto existing</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.

**LOCAL PLAN REVIEW – PREFERRED OPTION CONSULTATION RESPONSES TO SECTION 18: A DESIRABLE PLACE TO LIVE**

Company / Organisation	Response Number	Para/Policy	Type of Response	Summary of Response	WFDC Officer Response
				properties.	
	<a href="#">LPPO1770</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skyline change; this would be dramatically effected with my current views of the countryside.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO627</a>	18.13	Support	Support for paragraph 18.13.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3920</a>	Paragraph 18.13	Support	I support the intensification statements within the paragraphs 18.13 – 18.16.	Support and comment is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3922</a>	Paragraph 18.14	Support	I support the intensification statements within the paragraphs 18.13 – 18.16.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3923</a>	Paragraph 18.15	Support	I support the intensification statements within the paragraphs 18.13 – 18.16.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO3924</a>	Paragraph 18.16	Support	I support the intensification statements within the paragraphs 18.13 – 18.16.	Support is noted.
	<a href="#">LPPO1730</a>	New Road, Far Forest BR/RO/7	Object	<p>Objects for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on wildlife and habitats.</li> </ul>	Objection is noted.