

Précis of SAP Village Questionnaires PART 2

Village: CALLOW END	Part 2 Possible Sites																						
Summary of questionnaire responses:																							
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SITE</th> <th>FOR COUNT</th> <th>AGAINST COUNT</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>MHCE01</td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MHCE02</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MHCE03</td> <td>0</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MHCE04</td> <td>7</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MHCE05</td> <td>2</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All Sites</td> <td>14</td> <td>17</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	SITE	FOR COUNT	AGAINST COUNT	MHCE01	5	3	MHCE02	0	5	MHCE03	0	5	MHCE04	7	1	MHCE05	2	3	All Sites	14	17		
SITE	FOR COUNT	AGAINST COUNT																					
MHCE01	5	3																					
MHCE02	0	5																					
MHCE03	0	5																					
MHCE04	7	1																					
MHCE05	2	3																					
All Sites	14	17																					
Summary of site MHCE01 comments:																							
<p>FOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is right on the edge of the village. This is currently very unsightly and therefore would be improved by a good quality development. The land is in a state of disrepair and looks to have been unused for some time. It is hard to see any other further use than development. Access is close enough to main roads so as not to inconvenience existing residents. We think that the state that Bush Farm and Wheatfields Court is in, that development of these sites can only be most welcomed and beneficial to the village. The proposals for Stanbrook Abbey are governed by so many provisos that one can only hope common sense prevails whenever a sale is effected. SUPPORT - (Bush Farm, Wheatfields Court and Stanbrook) - The farm and Wheatfields are an eyesore so housing would be a good idea. Stanbrook would make a wonderful hotel, but if not I would not like to see it just stand empty so apartments would be okay. 	<p>AGAINST</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The access to this site is very poor. The existing roads are a problem themselves. The proposed site MHCE01 is indeed an eyesore and would be better divided up. I do not consider it is suitable for development due to the access problems and also due to the fact that it would effectively extend the village into the countryside. Planning permission already exists to convert brick-built barns into 3 dwellings, which seems suitable as plans fit character of site and location. But the land to the north of the lane to Bush Inn is already occupied by private houses and gardens and therefore not available. 																						

Summary of site MHCE02 comments:

FOR

-

AGAINST

- The suggestion to build on the low lying land in Lower Ferry Lane is preposterous. This parcel of land has progressively become more and more subject to flooding. The flood defences up-river are contributing to the problem. The Environment Agency are quite correct to classify the land as subject to flooding. In addition, in their report of January 2010, they state that 'climate change means that we are likely to see more severe and frequent flooding in the future.' Quite apart from the question of flooding, the land is of course, outside the village boundary. If permission were to be considered then logically, it would not be possible to prevent even more development on the east side of Lower Ferry Lane South of the playing fields. Does it really make sense to even consider spoiling the open views of so many people?
- Houses would only be built on road edge as lower part is in flood area.
- These areas are not in need of restoration so I object to building on them and using up our green space.
- Lower Ferry Lane is a narrow road. Large farm equipment uses the road a lot. Any further development (MHCE02/03) would add to the problems. Further flooding would be a serious problem and developing this site would add to this problem.
- Flood land. Flooding has progressively worsened during the last 35 years.

Summary of site MHCE03 comments:

FOR

-

AGAINST

- The suggestion to build on the low lying land in Lower Ferry Lane is preposterous. This parcel of land has progressively become more and more subject to flooding. The flood defences up-river are contributing to the problem. The Environment Agency are quite correct to classify the land as subject to flooding. In addition, in their report of January 2010, they state that 'climate change means that we are likely to see more severe and frequent flooding in the future.' Quite apart from the question of flooding, the land is of course, outside the village boundary. If permission were to be considered then logically, it would not be possible to prevent even more development on the east side of Lower Ferry Lane South of the playing fields. Does it really make sense to even consider spoiling the open views of so many people?
- Houses would only be built on road edge as lower part is in flood area.
- These areas are not in need of restoration so I object to building on them and using up our green space.
- Lower Ferry Lane is a narrow road. Large farm equipment uses the road a lot. Any further development (MHCE02/03) would add to the problems. Further flooding would be a serious problem and developing this site would add to this problem.
- Flood land. Flooding has progressively worsened during the last 35 years.

Summary of site MHCE04 comments:

FOR

- We think that the state that Bush Farm and Wheatfields Court is in, that development of these sites can only be most welcomed and beneficial to the village. The proposals for Stanbrook Abbey are governed by so many provisos that one can only hope common sense prevails whenever a sale is effected.
- SUPPORT - (Bush Farm, Wheatfields Court and Stanbrook) - The farm and Wheatfields are an eyesore so housing would be a good idea. Stanbrook would make a wonderful hotel, but if not I would not like to see it just stand empty so apartments would be okay.
- This was and could be again, a very attractive building and housing. A good development would again be an improvement.
- This brownfield site would benefit from re-development possibly with the provision of low cost accommodation for first time buyers or renting.
- Ref Wheatfield on the basis of several new houses not apartments or flats which would drastically increase transport onto Upton Road.
- A suggestion that either could have bungalows suitable for over 55 years old who live in houses in village. They could sell and buy a bungalow in a community similar to the Brackenhurst, Malvern Link. Wheatfield site, the long wall could be removed for safety.
- MHCE04 Wheatfields seems the most suitable area for development, the area is run down, has previously been used for occupation, and could be developed into several apartments.

AGAINST

- Traffic around the two blind bends leading from Powick is already heavy and regularly far in excess of the 30 mph limit. It is hard to see how this and the ensuing access problem could be overcome, without re-routing the road. The building still has many of its period features, and is of significant architectural interest and social historical interest. The building is structurally sound and renovateable. The building would be better converted to apartments with housing built in the grounds.

Summary of site MHCE05 comments:

FOR

- SUPPORT - (Bush Farm, Wheatfields Court and Stanbrook) - The farm and Wheatfields are an eyesore so housing would be a good idea. Stanbrook would make a wonderful hotel, but if not I would not like to see it just stand empty so apartments would be okay.
- A suggestion that either could have bungalows suitable for over 55 years old who live in houses in village. They could sell and buy a bungalow in a community similar to the Brackenhurst, Malvern Link. Wheatfield site, the long wall could be removed for safety.

AGAINST

- As Chairman of Stanbrook Abbey, our principal object is to try to secure a sympathetic future use for the historic buildings of Stanbrook Abbey. We wish to make a strong objection to the proposal that one of the potential sites for future development needs in South Worcestershire might include Stanbrook Abbey. As the Abbey buildings are listed buildings, we consider that this site is entirely inappropriate for development, which would be certain seriously to compromise their setting. We urge Stanbrook Abbey to be omitted from the list of proposed sites.
- My wife and I live very close to this site. Indeed the view from our lounge and kitchen is directly on to this magnificent building. We have no objection to a residential use for this building provided that the listed building elements are retained and sympathetically treated. We are concerned that the proposed site put forward includes the field immediately to the east of the Abbey. This field abuts our property. We are strongly against any proposals to develop this field and objected to this at the last Local Plan Inquiry. Whilst we re-iterate all the objections made then, we consider that retaining this field in its undeveloped state is essential to the setting of this important listed building and that development on the field would adversely affect this setting. The field provides a setting for the Abbey in 2 ways. Firstly, it provides a magnificent view from the Abbey itself to the River Severn and beyond - a good selling point for any development

of the Abbey. Secondly, it enables important views of the Abbey from various locations in Callow End. We consider that development on this field will adversely affect the Abbey and should not be permitted. We reiterate that we are not against a residential use for the Abbey itself nor other institutional or hotel uses or uses of a similar nature. The 2 other sites so far suggested in Callow End(which are not ruled out by being in the flood plain) - Wheatfields Park and Bush Farm - are more suitable for residential development, if the need is shown, than the field in front of the Abbey.

- The surroundings of the listed Stanbrook Abbey must be kept free from development.

Summary of suggested sites not identified through the SHLAA:

- Two suggestions at Beauchamp Lane: Beauchamp Lane, Callow End. Infilling between 80 Beauchamp Lane and Thatchings. Beauchamp Lane for two dwellings.
- East pf the M5