

## **SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE VILLAGES**

### **Summary of other comments:**

- I am not happy with the outlined housing in Dunley off the main road. Planning permission has been refused in the one area for poor access. Strange now that this is presumably not an issue.
- I think planning law in relation to caravan sites needs to be revised and clarified. Many sites are no longer for holiday caravans but sites for permanent "chalets" with full year-round residence.
- Little Witley is classified as a category 3 village with at least 2 key services and good access to public transport. There are no employment outlets in the village and the public transport is only accessible for most of the village by a long walk. The village should be re-classified to reflect the lack of key services and the lack of direct access to public transport.
- Placing Little Witley in Category 4. Possible consideration of designating all or part as a conservation area to preserve character of Church Lane, Well Farm, Netherleigh Court and the White House.
- It is considered that the designation of Alfrick as a Category 2 Village is on the borderline between Category 2 and Category 3. It is suggested that categorisation of Alfrick should be the subject of review.
- The exhibition at Callow End on the 26th March was nothing less than a display of developer's commercial wish list.
- There was no explanation as to how many people needed to be housed and where they would work. And there was no prioritisation of whole health, welfare and recreational facilities would be sited to support the development.
- The impact of such development on the quality of life and wellbeing of those already resident in any area. There are numerous opportunities to build exciting and community driven, active and sustainable developments in NEW areas, instead as always trying to 'bolt-on' to those that already exist.
- The proposed Worcester Transport Strategy will be completely inadequate for the resolution of these problems.
- The Councils and Planning Committees should look very carefully at the reasons given to increase housing levels in and around Worcester.
- Planning around Callow End, Kempsey, Hanley Swan will have further impact on traffic congestion and will affect tourism
- Cycle tracks are proposed in some places, these should be 'multi-user' for horses as well. Although some cycle tracks will be for 'commuters' to get to work, others will be leisure routes. These could help link up existing (and new!) bridle-paths for better routes for riders/carriage drivers, to help keep horses off increasingly busy roads. See Trails Trust org in Mendip area for research into multi-user tracks.
- Not to pass plans to build on site behind the Crown Pub in Martley.
- North Western bypass, should take the shorter, less expensive route crossing the A433 Hallow Road between St John's & Hallow.
- Do not accept Regional targets.
- More bottom up planning, not top down planning.

- When Kempsey's flood defences are built, what is going to happen to the water that would have spilled over into the village centre? I guess it will breach the banks back towards Draycott, which suggests drainage must be improved in this area and around Napleton.
- Rural life is under constant pressure. Farmers/growers are now being asked to grow more food, increase production and all sites offered are on farms where food production takes place.
- Modernisation of the sewerage system Surface water run off would increase with more housing
- Creating mixed housing communities, whereby older residents can down size within the area they have lived most of their lives.
- The green belt, between towns and villages should be preserved at all costs. There are many examples of Urban Sprawl and they are very ugly.
- Development needs top standard for sustainability and Eco.
- Can drains and sewers cope with more housing?
- No more housing. Save the green fields.
- Better use should be made of brownfield sites. Re-assess housing need - villages are getting too big.
- RSS targets are absurd. We should work within existing development spaces and encourage new patterns of occupancy to avoid ever smaller no of people living in ever increasing number of homes. New roads should be the last thing on planner's minds.
- More smaller housing projects than one or two large ones
- Everything I have seen and everyone I have spoken to fails to give precise accurate plans - why is this?
- Identifying local vernacular architecture whilst allowing some contemporary innovation.
- Listen to the local people before making any decisions they have to live with the consequences.
- It is shocking that no mention of eco homes has been mentioned. They must all be sustainable with green roofs to keep the village feel not suburbia. Solar panels must be included and heat exchange systems. The density proposed is mad. They must have 3 parking spaces each. There are 2 government issues here, more housing and carbon savings. They must be combined in an integrated plan.
- Any houses built should be appropriate for a village e.g. gardens, encouraging families with children. Crowded urban developments are totally unsuitable. The numbers of houses indicated (189) is completely inappropriate for a village this size.
- Agriculture. Green natural spaces, keeping hedges for the birds / wild life and for environmental purposes. More People - more cars and more pollution. Do the Councils help us to move to a conducive lifestyle? We are living on increasingly over populated rural and prime farm land i.e. MHGW03. We need more land for feeding the population not bringing it from abroad. At the moment, I can see trees, grass, flowers, wild life, birds and until last year, cows, sheep, horses. We also need viable land for trees and other means of destroying

increasing greenhouse gasses. Please keep rural land sites green and not the ugly Bloor buildings that are such a blot on the landscape.

- This plan should not be permitted to continue.
- Advertising needs to be done on proposed sites. Most residents found out about these plans by accident. There was not a meeting held in Great Witley for local residents. Landowners who put their sites up for development should be required to tell local residents first. The current dwellings per hectare formula is not realistic for rural sites.
- The whole issue has been badly handled, and very badly advertised in the area. The onus should have been on the Council to advise residents of what was happening but this was not done. The meeting was only advertised in local post offices, both did not list the villages involved. Libraries only have access to the internet and then only on request and most people do not know what was happening. The P.C.C was not initially willing to do anything and the landowners naturally wished to keep everything quiet.
- The phasing of redevelopment needs to be considered over the next 15 years and impact of new development on traffic volumes given the current high use of main roads in the village.
- People have chosen to live in villages because they value the character of such an environment. A few new houses may be acceptable but the imposition of large scale development is inappropriate and unwelcome.
- Council Tax too high. Request a specific presentation in Clifton.
- Planning Department needs to relax their core issues for development of small areas of land for building affordable housing - otherwise rural communities will become a population of elderly residents.
- One car parking space (off-road) for every bedroom in all dwellings. (This should assist meeting "open-space"/proximity issues).
- Numbers of proposed new dwellings should be less than 10% to avoid an imbalance with the current village and its character.
- This exercise is a result of an ill conceived Government directive.
- Consideration should be given to build new towns to resolve housing problems.