Introduction

Town and parish councillors throughout the three South Worcestershire districts attended a series of meetings over November 2010, which were also attended by District and County Councillors. The purpose of these events was to update town and parish councils on the position of the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy, following the change in government from May 2010.

The aim and objectives of the events were:

**Aim**

To discuss the community leadership role of parish & town councils, and update them on any new Government policy changes regarding the development plan system.

**Objectives**

By the end of the meetings delegates were:

i) provide with an update on the development plan system under the new Government

ii) given details on progress towards a South Worcestershire Development Plan.

iii) appraised of the key opportunities to get involved within the new timetable and emphasis on the 'localism' agenda.

iv) made aware of the opportunities to assist in identifying a locally justified growth agenda.

v) provided with the details of the information that exists about the plan area and how this can inform a framework for the plan.

**Background**

The revocation of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy, with the ascent of the ‘Decentralisation and Localism Bill’ later in 2011, and the associated targets it set (housing numbers, employment land etc.) has meant there is now an opportunity to produce a plan that reflects the local economic and housing aspirations of South Worcestershire as opposed to those of the Region. The result will be the production of a revised preferred option strategy for South Worcestershire and the incorporation of the Joint Core Strategy and Site Allocations and Policies Plan into a single document – the South Worcestershire Development Plan.
Town and parish councils have an important role in contributing to this process, with the Government’s forthcoming legislative changes to plan making preparation having implications for the level and regard of community input into the plan preparation. In moving the new development plan forward and parish councils, as community representatives, are being encouraged to take a lead within their communities in the redrafting process and engaging directly with district councillors and planning officers with respect to their community’s views.

Therefore, from the three partner Local Authority’s perspective, the ongoing preparation of the new Plan has been guided by:

- how to continue engaging with local communities;
- producing a revised timetable which allows for additional community engagement but still delivers a joint plan as soon as possible;
- what additional evidence and work is required to review the emerging strategy.

The commitment remains to deliver a joint plan, but it will seek to deliver ‘locally justified’ growth and a framework to guide investment in the area. Town and parish councils, as ‘lower tier authorities’, are well placed to relay the aspirations and concerns of local people within their towns and parishes into this process.

**Briefing and Workshop Events**

Each of the three partner authorities hosted two events each (see below) that were open to town and parish councils across the locality as well as district and county councillors. Invites were sent out to the clerks in early October 2010 and then subsequently background briefing papers nearer to the meetings. In total 173 people attended the events representing town and parish councils across South Worcestershire (Appendix 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10th November 2010</td>
<td>3.30pm – 5.00pm</td>
<td>Civic Chamber, Wychavon DC Offices, Pershore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th November 2010</td>
<td>10.30am – 12.00noon</td>
<td>The Court Room, The Guildhall, Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th November 2010</td>
<td>6.30pm – 8.00pm</td>
<td>Tenbury Pump Rooms, Tenbury Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd November 2010</td>
<td>6.30pm – 8.00pm</td>
<td>Civic Chamber, Wychavon DC Offices, Pershore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th November 2010</td>
<td>6.30pm – 8.00pm</td>
<td>Priory Lodge Hall, Council House, Malvern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th November 2010</td>
<td>6.30pm – 8.00pm</td>
<td>The Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Worcester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The format of the sessions included a presentation (see Appendix 2) that set out:

- the impacts of RSS revocation; what does localism mean?
- the Role of the Local Strategic Partnership and Local Enterprise Partnerships: A Revised Vision for the County and its Districts.
- a revised project timetable.
- how and when town, parish councils and the public can get involved.

A series of small focus groups followed which explored key principles and strategic priorities for the area, facilitated by a planning officer from the SWDP team, under the following themed topic areas:

- Housing;
- Economic prosperity; and
- Infrastructure.

A series of questions were developed in order to open up discussions, based on consultation with the communities as part of the Joint Core Strategy process:

1. How should Worcester grow over the next 30 years?
2. As an economic centre - a source of jobs, education, leisure and retail for the County what should Worcester seek to provide to meet future needs and remain competitive with other cities?
3. What are the views on future growth and development in the main towns across South Worcestershire (Droitwich Spa, Evesham, Pershore, Malvern, Tenbury and Upton-upon-Severn).
4. What are your views on the future growth of the larger villages in Wychavon and Malvern Hills Districts? What do parish plans tell us about growth aspirations and what in particular do village communities want or need?
5. What benefits do growth and development bring to your area?
6. What makes a place successful and what would communities like to see happening within their area to ensure its success? E.g. more jobs, affordable homes, services and facilities for all, more opportunities for leisure, improved tourist offering, better quality educational facilities, improved roads/public transport/cycleways/footpaths or public realm.
The above questions were to prompt a two way discussion, and other areas were also discussed. All of the key points were noted and these are summarised for each meeting at Appendix 3.

**Feedback**

A summary of the meetings, workshop notes and supporting technical background information including parish plan summaries (Appendix 4) were sent to all town and parish councils by the beginning of December 2010. The information circulated provided individual town and parish councils to begin their own discussions with their communities and feedback into the process of drafting the revised development plan during the first part of 2011.

**Appendix 1**

**Malvern Hills**

Thursday 16 November 2010

Clifton-upon-Teme
Knighton-on-Teme
Lindridge Ward
Shrawley
Tenbury

Attendance: 9

Wednesday 24 November 2010

Alfrick & Lulsley
Baldwin
Birlingham
Birtsmorton
Broadheath
Castlemorton
Dyson Perrins
Hallow
Hanley Castle
Holt
Kempsey
Little Witley
Longdon, Queenhill & Holdfast
Madresfield
Malvern
Malvern Link
Malvern Priory
Malvern Wells
Malvern West
Newland
Pendock
Ripple
Upton & Hanley
Welland
West Malvern

Attendance: 41

Worcester City

Monday 15 November 2010

Abberley
Bransford
Childswickham
Hindlip, Martin Hussingtree & Salwarpe
Hallow
Holt
Kempsey
Lower Broadheath
Malvern Hills District Council
North Claines
Norton-juxta-Kempsey
Ombersley & Doverdale
Warndon
Wichenford
Worcester City Council

Attendance: 19

Tuesday 30 November 2010

Abberley
Bredon
Hallow
Hindlip, Martin Hussingtree & Salwarpe
Kempsey
Lindridge
Lower Broadheath
North Claines
Rushwick
Tibberton

Attendance: 15

Wychavon DC

Wednesday 10 November 2010

Abbots Morton
Badsey & Aldington
Broughton Hackett
Church Lench
Droitwich Spa
Evesham
Eldersfield
Fladbury & Cropthorne
Hindlip, Martin Hussingtree & Salwarpe
Kemerton
Offenham
Norton & Lenchwick
Pebworth
Pershore
Stoultton
White Ladies
Whittington
Wyre Piddle

Attendance: 62

Thursday 23 November 2010

Badsey & Aldington
Bredon, Bredons Norton & Westmancote
Broadway
Charlton
Crowle
Dodderhill
Droitwich Spa
Elmley Castle, Bricklehampton & Netherton
Evesham
Grafton Flyford
Hartlebury
Harvington
Inkberrow
Malvern
North Claines
North Piddle
Norton-juxta-Kempsey
Oddingley
Overbury & Conderton
Saleway
Upton upon Severn
Westmancote

Attendance: 27
Appendix 2
Progress Towards a South Worcestershire Development Plan
Power Point Presentation
Progress towards a South Worcestershire Development Plan
Parish and Town Focus Groups
Summary

• Introductions

• Revised Timetable

• Evidence Base

• Today’s Discussions

• The South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP)
Introductions

- The team
- What we have provided: the ‘packs’
- Expectations from today’s discussions
- What else can be done?
Basic Timetable

Preferred Options Consultation: September 2011

Pre-Submission Consultation: May/June 2012

Submission to SoS: September 2012

Hearing: January/February 2013

Adoption: April 2013
Evidence Base

- RSS Evidence Base: still a material consideration (RSS is NOT officially revoked/abolished yet)
- Our evidence base: more detailed and up to date
- The views of the public: emerging Localism Agenda and Open Source Planning
- Limitations and opportunities: what could be developed and where
- Views on market realism in terms of deliverability
Today’s discussions could include:

- Worcester’s future in South Worcestershire, the County and beyond…
- The future for market towns
- The future for large villages
- The future for smaller villages
- Economic issues
- Population changes
- Infrastructure challenges
- Affordable Housing
- Environmental enhancement and protection
The Development Plan

- *Economic Prosperity* for the city, towns and villages and rural areas
- What drives economic prosperity?
- Threats to economic prosperity
- Opportunities to encourage economic prosperity
The Focus Groups

• We will try to cover all broad subjects:

• Discussion will be recorded on paper, but won’t be attributable to individuals

• Facilitators will try to allow discussion to flow freely, but try not to go off the point!

• We will provide more ‘packs’ for those of you who want to run another group yourselves (with your local residents, community groups or businesses, for instance)
Appendix 3

Malvern Hills District Council

Pump Room, Tenbury Wells 16 November 2010

- ECONOMIC PROSPERITY
- TOWNS AND RURAL AREAS
- INFRASTRUCTURE

- Small enterprising business parks require decent broadband services.
- Broadband facilities, rural employment, working from home % of time therefore reduce environment impact.
- Malvern Hills District short of jobs therefore commuting.
- Limited employment in district. MHDC is to Malvern centric. Too many opportunities go to Malvern. Tenbury misses out.
- Villages require a mix of development to remain sustainable e.g. market house and local employment. Balance is restricted by current plans. Market housing should be allowed to be built.
- Shared equity housing doesn’t work.
- Planning Strategy should respect the demand of the local population – common sense!
- 8 river crossings in Worcester: Holt Bridge under pressure put constraints on employers locating west of River Severn.
- Economic prosperity – local people working locally spending locally.
- Migration = need to manage this huge pressure:
  - migrants have different views of how countryside should be run.
  - local generally accept village need to change but differ over speed of change.
- Housing mix – no problem in approving 6+ bed houses in rural area if there is the demand.
- Planning system doesn’t work in some cases. Example cited: brownfield land policies promote businesses to close to cash in on value of land. Petrol station to affordable housing. Debate whether this is a planning issue or a commercial viability issue i.e. are there enough people to use the business.
- Why do we have settlement boundaries in rural areas? What are serving? Does it distort?
- Services need to be more flexible – shop in pub.
- Localise job creation in rural areas – opportunities need to be offered to local population = community.
- Fundamental principle within settlement boundary squeeze development, in open countryside nothing. Requires common sense. Current policy restricts village prosperity.
- Lot of houses in a few places or lots of places, therefore spread the development across Malvern Hills District:
  - Determine village hinterland potentially ½ mile from village?
  - Where are they going to work?
- Rural transport should be more highly considered in categorisation.
Debated affordable housing:
1. Argument it allows people the rural life but doesn’t tie them to local employment.
2. Allows people with connections to live locally therefore retain sense of local community.

New legislation on affordable housing better at linking local people to local houses.

Once local connections lost – access to affordable housing should be taken away (disagreement within group).

Bigger the house – greater opportunities to work locally. Planning should be less prescriptive on housing extensions. Flexibility would improve local prosperity.

Rural areas must not be forgotten.

Article 4/Agricultural diversification. Application examples of planning constraints: businesses restricted to expand £ per land/year.

How do you develop a village? Do not want pieces of urban area (Warndon) in villages. Village should look and feel like villages. Lower density in the villages. Even if want suburban ratios i.e. 30/ha infrastructure is not there.

Need the employment! Housing doesn’t generate employment.

MHDC should be facilitating development not restricting development! Example on Tenbury Business Park.

Central Technology Belt (CTB) – any evidence that CTB is actually doing anything? Is this going to be a central plank – not sure agree – does this need to be thought about differently in economic.

Jobs, affordable homes, rural transport – jobs and affordable homes would keep communities going.

Farmyards – business parks/small businesses 2-3 jobs here and there. Transport is a big issue.

Problem getting people in and out – improved communications both physically and digitally.

Big rural part of Worcestershire.

Affordable homes linked with local economy.

Aspiration – attract well paid jobs – negate need for subsidised housing.

Technically minded people in Tenbury area will commute out - need to retain jobs in Tenbury.

2/3 housing for wealthy people/retirement.

Losing younger people from the area – must take note of what is in rural area.

Agricultural – mechanisation of farms/no one working on farms – different forms of agriculture farm diversification.

Most disposable income – ageing people will encourage wealth.

Role of recreation and leisure – ageing population – leading leisure destination trap the wealth and transfer to the local area.

Need to think through where jobs coming from.

See Tenbury as Tenbury and Buford.

Skills – workers provided - areas concentrate a workforce – live/work units – become more prevalent.

Improved Broadband needed.

New employment sites within villages? Businesses associated with old farmyards. Change of use.

Farm buildings shouldn't be converted to residential – creates more problems.
• Live/work units – rural lifestyle – promote lifestyle (rural idyll) but provide infrastructure:
  – communications
  – local services
  – providing a hub in rural communities.
• Providing a ‘hub’ for local services/business supplies.
• Isolation – too much driving – focusing on what mums need – carries massive sway. Mums can experience isolation.
• Better schools – education systems. Schools in rural areas will encourage wealth.
• Younger people – encouraging them back – infrastructure and a brilliant education system how much can the local community influence this.
• Short of affordable housing – always people on waiting list – are they really going to those who need them? People out of towns and into villages.
• Tenbury couldn’t cope with the natural growth – not enough development.
• Empty homes – a lot available/on market - national problem. A lot of retired people/not got enough bungalows.
• Can’t understand why tax payers have to pay for people to live where they want to.
• Where does the need exist within the rural areas.
• Perpetuating the economic low paid jobs in providing affordable housing.
• How do we create high value jobs – current employment in rural areas not offering this?
• Difference between ‘want and need’.
• ‘Ghettoisation’ of rural areas?
• Challenging right of an individual to want to live wherever they choose.
• Education and aspirations – more problems short term.
• Society changes slowly.
• Is it about economic prosperity or local communities.
• Should invest in education system.
• Shouldn’t subsidise affordable housing take rough with smooth.
• Need to be mobile to achieve economic prosperity – parallel with China – mobile workforce.
• Will rural areas become playground for the rich?
• Caravan sites/mobile homes – wooded areas/not necessarily an impact on landscape. Certain areas of countryside could develop.
• Transport – because low paid can’t afford to travel. Retirement age – more bungalows in Tenbury as people get less mobile and want for more back into towns.

**Strategic Infrastructure**

Education – who will pay for it?
Centrally funded Tenbury definitely needs a sixth form. Grammar school system was good.

• Education system class leading – excellent sixth form in area – prosperity.
• Think it would happen naturally – don’t think it should be funded by housing development. Supply and demand.
• Backlog of people who have missed boat – can’t ignore them. Need a balance in society.
• Private subsidy for affordable housing.
• Providing affordable housing pins economic prosperity/long term health.
• Problem solved by education/not affordable housing/cross subsidy.
• Retain local services if make town prosperous. Tesco’s delivery, cheaper to get it delivered online.
• Community spirit – retaining local services:
  - use it or lose it/still need to use it.
  - Bigger issue for rural areas/pressure the ‘rural high street’.
  - Bigger issue than affordable housing – retaining rural services.
  - More specialist shops in Tenbury.
  - Some individuals cover a very large area/advertising retail frontage.
  - Landmarks/outstanding examples food/retail – niche market.
  - Cross subsidise?
  - Enterprise on High Street - cut rates fiscal policy.

Priory Lodge Hall, Malvern 24 November 2010

Group 1

ECONOMIC PROSPERITY

• Broadband needed throughout, including rural areas. Cost of delivery very high.
• Skills/Transportation - important in rural areas. Accessibility an issue for youngsters in rural areas.
• Infrastructure is a key concern/requirement to promote economic prosperity transport/schools/shops etc. How can the District Council help deliver the infrastructure required?
• Small scale - high added value businesses important:
  - Also need diversity of jobs – not just high value – service jobs and spin-offs from high value.
  - University can be a hub for new jobs/research/high end jobs/
  - Worcester’s role – important for jobs for citizens of MHDC – Worcester will grow –
  - Mixed blessings for smaller villages nearby – use services, but fear being swamped.
  - Suggestion employment should be provided east of Worcester close to motorway – counter argument that jobs needed to the west/city centre to serve MHDC.

HOUSING

• Mix including affordability important.
• Protection of character of villages:
  - Why build homes that remain empty – e.g. North Site, Malvern.
  - Discussion - that issue is finance/mortgage rather than over-supply.
• Impact of Worcester requirements and fear of coalescence with nearby villages.
• Limited housing requirements in villages.
• Local needs – how defined?
• Local people’s needs, schooling, but other services also important.
• Worcester’s housing growth is Worcester’s problem – not for adjacent authorities. Some disagreement to this too – need to address Worcester’s growth.
• Flood plains – constraint to development in main towns. Flood defences help, but don’t help deliver more land for development.
• Agree that one size does not fit all – regarding settlements.
• Update Parish Plans: how much coverage? How up to date? difficult to get people engaged. Need to update housing needs surveys at the same time.
• Housing development needs to be related to infrastructure – transport links, schools etc small development rather than very large development.
• Comprehensive planning approach to sites where more than one developer to stop them ducking below affordable housing thresholds in villages.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

• Son of SWJCS and its strategic objectives – need to consider localism, local people’s wishes.
• Ignore Worcester/Birmingham. Some felt we couldn’t ignore the wider picture/strategic infrastructure needs.
• Southern Link important and a north west link road – unlikely that NW link road can be delivered in plan period.
• What can MHDC do to help retain community facilities in villages, e.g. shops/pubs?
• Parish Plans – can not update every 2/3 years – costly and time consuming. Not full coverage of Parish Plans. But some very good – cover many topics.
• Big Society? Often down to particular individuals – many do not engage.
• Five year review points for plan.

**Group 2**

**ECONOMIC**

• We need a clear basis of wider economic conditions.
• Townsend Way - focus employment growth here but potential infrastructure issues growth.
• Opportunities to grow 'high-tech' businesses.
• Effect of more mature residents in terms of employment and economic activity.
• Increasing exporting businesses.
• Employment – maximise if to attract high quality employment into area – pro-active not just reactive.

**INFRASTRUCTURE**

• Fibre – optic broadband (to the Cabinet) – publically promoted.
• Realism on the use of cars.
• Accessibility of services – doctors etc for retirement development/managed housing.
• Malvern is throttled by Worcester.
• Issues with Rail Network – capacity?
• Southern Link Road dualling.
• Support for North West Link Road.
• Second bridge over River Severn.
• Road from Bamards Green to M5.
• Encourage business opportunities around existing infrastructure – Junction 7.
• Vision for transport infrastructure.

**HOUSING**

• Could Worcester develop higher density housing (up, not outward).
• Should the market decide?
• Type of housing (Victorian housing stock) – is this a problem?
• Larger villages with better services more suitable for retirement/managed schemes.
• Sequential preferability – facilities first.
• Positively encourage windfall sites – should be included in target/plan.
• Empty Homes Policy.
• Market affordable housing.
• Historic village settlement boundaries – parish plans to define this. Give villages option of self-categorisation.
• New self contained small villages to be developed?
• Mobile homes as part solution to affordability.
• Question of boundary change around Worcester overspill?

**Group 3**

**ECONOMIC PROSPERITY**

• More home working, better broadband.
• QinetiQ workers don’t live in Malvern but put wage levels up, impacting on house affordability.
• Support small employment sites in villages – farm building conversion.
• Good broadband, good supply, good connection – the triangle for success.
• Need good access, better roads, and direct access to M5.
• Why not locate east of Worcester, why is it a no-go area.
• Implementation of development, design very important.
• Business rates should be set to induce new employment.
• Cultural infrastructure important (to what?).
• Balance of tourism (visitor economy).
• Uncertain whether any of main employment sector will grow.

**HOUSING**

• Better mix of development needed.
• Market decides mix, we can learn from it.
• We should give developers a steer.
• Affordable housing being pushed to villages but no jobs there, cost of living in rural areas increasing.
• Which comes first, housing or jobs?
• New houses should be tied to availability of jobs.
• Infrastructure issues with any significant development in villages.
• Affordable housing can be used to house “problem” families.
• Offering building standards between affordable housing and social housing.
• People do not want estates.
• Quality of design influences the acceptability of a housing scheme.
• Villages need to be sustainable.
• Parish plans need to be updated.
• Look at group of parishes.

INFRASTRUCTURE

• Villages have services provided from more than one centre.
• Poor highway infrastructure, need clean, cheap, regular public transport.
• Putting buses on with few passengers, very wasteful.
• We will never have public transport which suits everybody. Majority of people will never use it, does not serve people’s needs.
• Another river crossing to west (of Worcester).
• Need to plan for long term with public transport.
• Need more housing in rural areas to support community infrastructure.
• Need clear definition of responsibilities for land drainage, particularly in villages/rural areas; why assume agricultural land should be flooded.
• Rivers no longer dredged, ditches not cleaned as in past.

Worcester City Council

The Guildhall, Worcester 15 November 2010

Group 1

Housing

How affordable is Housing in your area?
• Early engagement with Community First for local housing needs survey.
• Locally let houses are now being let to others from outside, were only let to 'locals' for short period. When re-let, have been let to people outside i.e. going back to the normal system.
• New housing is not affordable.
• Need for affordable housing in Leigh Sinton (Malvern); especially for elderly.
• Location/good access to health facilities/nurseries not mentioned in handouts. Is an important aspect, especially for elderly.
• Could facilities be bought to villages, rather than a specific building for them?

Do you need subsidised housing in your area?
• Locals not necessarily getting subsidised housing.
• Occupants are brought in from outside.
• Young residents cannot afford housing; villages may stagnate as a result.
• Need 'low cost', rather than affordable.
• Negotiation/provision of low cost down to local policies.
• People do not want to live on estates though due to (disorderly people) being transferred to social housing.

Is there a good sense of community?
• Yes (villages).
• No if areas is lived in by commuters e.g. Warndon. Crime is day due to lack of residents.
• People may not always want to be in a community – need to cater for choice but up to residents if they choose to reside there.
• Consideration of youth important.
• Nowhere for elderly to downsize which could release family housing.
• Incentives for elderly to move.
Do you consider your local environment well cared for?
- Voluntary activities e.g. litter picks, encourage sense of pride; but need council support.
- Issue of too many signs (e.g. advertising).
- Lengthsman scheme – good for Parish Council; need flexibility for public rights of way; if to be no further allocation, needs flexibility.
- Part-funding by Parish of Council employee to do similar work in Warndon.
- Voluntary/community work for similar schemes – how do you go about getting this?

Should we cater for in-migration (inter-regional)?
- Not to the west of Worcester, employers do not want to locate here.
- Norton Parkway hub could be an option? But issue of lack of current public funding.
- Worcester provides for around 65% of jobs in city.
- Issue of southern link road – lack of foresight in past.

Economic prosperity

Where the employment now/where will locals be employed in future?
- Fast broadband needed in villages – enable home working.
- Some jobs will be at home. But planning issue at moment id want to employ a few people. Would need addressing.
- Infrastructure in Worcester needs sorting, reason why people live on outskirts for commuting.
- Not positive about rapid transport scheme. Bromyard road too narrow.
- Ronkswood scheme no better.
- Need a large amount of money in highway improvement scheme – or do not spend!
- What are your main infrastructure priorities? Basic road traffic system.
- Where do we want employers to go if cannot go in city?
- Park and ride – are they being used?; Needs to be accessible
- Historic infrastructure/architecture an issue.
- Bus system does not work in city, does in e.g. Oxford.
- Do not agree with large housing. Growth related to infrastructure, which needs to come first.
- Could be room for development in Halt, to help resolve traffic problem.
- Better use of derelict sites e.g. Old Ronkswood site/around Diglis.
- Housing in villages – problem of families having more than one car. Garages too small so parking on roads.

Locally important industries?
- Small businesses.
- Lack of good hotels.
- Employment (small scale) should be directed to villages.
- Gaps of land allocated to stop Malvern growing into Leigh Sinton. Want to keep this as now down to 600m. Other villages in same boat.
- How big should these gaps be to protect village identity?
- Commuting should not increase; but depends on location.
- Tourism important so cannot prevent this community (especially around Malvern).
- Carbon footprint though!
How to get trains to stop/improve rail links to other towns?

If growth, where?
- If no infrastructure, bring development to road systems e.g. east and south (M5/M50).
- Established villages – low cost/affordable housing e.g. Rushwick (smaller development i.e. 200 dwellings; not 400).
- Issue of getting community facilities/preserve existing; Important if to retain elderly.
- Warndon Village post office under threat.

What do you think of the Big Society?
- Why then encourage supermarkets/big business, destroying local businesses?
- Local village stores cannot compete – may decline.
- How to make village stores successful?
- Sometimes shops do not survive despite development.
- Isolation of elderly from communities.
- Elderly may not want to leave village for new housing in cities but want to downsize, with help from friends/family to get about.
- System for balancing out housing relocation in villages – How? Not used to full extent.

Group 2

Rural Areas/Towns
- Rural communities want to be involved in site identification.
- Inward versus indigenous growth?
- How can we retain population in villages?
- Also need to accommodate older population.
- Pressure from Worcester growth on neighbouring settlements.
- Decline of rural facilities/services. Need growth but = role of villages to keep facilities.
- Affordable housing crucial. For whom?
- Current rural picture can not be reversed.
- UK population growth needs to be met.
- Affordable housing needs to be for local people.
- Could shared equity help? Downsize houses too.
- New development in villages needs to be in correct location.
- House types need to be tailored to each village’s needs.
- Pressure pm developers (Landowners) to move on building out sites.
- What should attract people Worcester – river, leisure, shops.

Infrastructure
- Crucial for delivery of houses/development.
- Parkway = economic growth. Linked to M5.
- Concern that too much focus is being placed in growth of University.
- Can the infrastructure take anymore growth? Traffic/gridlock.
- Key services needed e.g. GP etc, with development.
- Rural schools are vibrant – but pupils come from outside area. Knock on impact on after school activity.
- Quality of services proportional to take-up.
- How sustainable is it to travel in car to services?
• Worcester needs park and ride to west of city.
• Private car becoming less affordable. This makes it expensive to live/move about in rural areas, therefore rural bus services become more important.
• Bus service private operators = uncoordinated service.
• Arrival experience via public transport to Worcester is poor.
• ‘Special’ bus services i.e. to hospital can not be advertised?!
• Rural high speed broadband – especially west of River Severn.

Economic Prosperity
• Low wage area = Worcester City.
• Out commuting for higher wages.
• Adjacent to rural areas with high levels of economic deprivation.
• Need higher wage economy to keep people local.
• House prices higher in Cheltenham.
• Does growth have to be economic development led?! This could extra housing to rural villages.
• Tourism = spend.
• River is a significant attraction. More needs to be done.
• Viability is an issue on smaller sites, especially S106 payments. Puts a break on development.
• Science park to replace older industries.
• University looking for research and development opportunities.
• Move towards local working. Better broadband = more rural economic growth.
• Live/work role.
• Impact of internet shopping!

The Guildhall, Worcester 30 November 2010

Group 1

Economic Prosperity

Jobs for community
• Fast broadband needed.
• Section 106 industrial units.

Important local industries
• Capitalise on Worcester as university city.
• Access to industry.
• Infrastructure needed to cope with traffic.
• Small scale business.
• Agricultural opportunities?
• Norton Parkway – key for communities.
• Educational structure inhibiting.

Infrastructure

Access to facilities
• Poor transport to some facilities.
• No support from national rail.
• Worcester ‘ring road’ over capacity.
Housing
- Mix of housing supporting local people.
- Affordable housing not affordable.
- Affordable housing needs assessment to be based on local assessment.
- Housing association, Parish councils and local authority communication.
- Parish happy to accommodate small numbers of housing.
- Category 2 and 3 do want and need some housing.

Group 2

Affordable Housing
- Kempsey, Abberley – limited chance for youngsters.
- Salwarpe – very expensive.
- Rushwick had a successful affordable housing scheme; school needs more people; Abberley in same situation.
- North Claines – seems to be many on market.
  - But are they at ‘affordable price’?
- Identify need; then work with landowner.
- Where are people coming from for affordable housing?
- Where are jobs for people?
- Bredon parish council – performed own assessment, found one percent need.
- Needs to be reserved for people with local connections.
- Tibberton – affordable housing were as part of private housing scheme.
- Definition of sustainability needs to consider wildlife.
- Sustainability needs to be looked at differently in AONBs.
- Problem of people not minding affordable housing but not wanting private which subsidises affordable housing e.g. Bredon- would rather have less affordable housing as do not want private.
- Need for different types of homes e.g. for elderly.
- Does Worcester have key worker policy?

Economic Prosperity
- Lower Broadheath - 500/600 work in nearby industrial estate [Elizabeth the Chef food processing plant]. Workers are not local, either bussed in or Polish workers walk from Worcester.
- Strong Portuguese population on Worcester.
- Bredon - 90% of working population out commute.
- Worcester losing employment sites to more prosperous uses (if owners desire residential e.g. Kays).
- Why local evidence is important to back up what is needed.
- Not much employment in villages.
- Residents will commute.

Type required
- High tech; farm diversification to employment uses.
- Bredon - would like retail, local services, employment but have not got suitable sites.
- Balance between retaining village identity and retaining/providing services/needs.
- Consider resource efficiency.
- Where will people come from to shop in Worcester?
- Definition of ‘sustainability’ needing ‘10% growth’?
• Economy is shrinking, so how attract local jobs?
• ‘Quality of life’ – selling point but need to maintain.
• Focus on what sort of jobs want in S. Worcestershire, and then attract those employers.
• Worcester Bosch - issue of skilled workforce in local area:
  - need to train local population.
  - Will University create relevant courses? Are students local?

Community facilities
• Bredon – poor parking, good sports facilities, full health centre and school.
• Public transport cannot cater for current employment set-up.
• People with high-tech skills (commuters) realise they have to travel for work.
• Bredon Parish – survey found more bus services will not reduce car use.
• Work is no longer ‘lifetime’ so less relocation to near work.

Wychavon District Council

Civic Centre, Pershore Wednesday 10 November

Group 1

Economic Prosperity

• Economic prosperity – involved in provision of housing.
• Providing more jobs – won’t necessarily improve house prices problem.
• Consideration of transport and infrastructure → employment.
• Need to take account of people working from home.
• Importance of infrastructure.
• Tram local service – using railway network.
• Carbon emissions – households without cars – lead to isolation.
• Village shop – main infrastructure element/community event for rural areas.
• Need to look at public transport system – rail links interconnections between park and ride services.
• Importance of planning decisions upon vitality of village services:
  → Implications.
  → Affect of on-line shopping – village shops.
• Farm shops – not a way of encouraging non car use.
• Supermarkets – should be providing local produce.
• Importance of small businesses in towns/villages:
  → improve economic prosperity.

• Importance of cycle routes – significant improvement needed.
• Lack of drainage?
• Employment – issue of large scale distribution warehouses → lorries – traffic movement.
• Specialist businesses/shops- local services and facilities.
• Use classification – want B1, B2. B8 not required.
• Development Plans – can be flexible – Needs to reflect changing employment patterns.
• Support self build housing.
• Need to distinguish between employment creation in towns and villages.
  Large businesses cannot sustain villages – out commuting:
  → Broadband connections – small independent service.
If provide employment site in village – result in commuting in/out.
- Need for energy efficient – existing housing stock:
  → Retrofitting.
- Immigration – retirement?
- Commuting.

How Affordable is Housing in your Area?

- Rural areas – not affordable.
- Inefficient housing use.
- Link between economic prosperity and housing stock.
- Housing for specialist jobs e.g. nurses, police.
- Interdependent.
- Issue of HA – empty properties.
- Housing should be spread throughout District – mix of housing – transport and infrastructure needs to be in place.
  → throughout villages and towns.
  → Not sustainable – have not got many facilities in rural villages/towns to support housing figures.
- Importance of village/town identity.

Environment

- Payments to farmers to enhance environment/wildlife – move in right direction.
- Move – younger professionals moving into rural areas.
- Community maintained – Pershore.
- Importance of open space in urban areas – market towns → need.
- Importance of identity – large scale developments – impact upon environment.
- Shortage of allotments – need for more.
- Sports, recreation facilities – not necessarily needed in the countryside – increased dependence on car.
- Maintenance, managing policing issues – with green space/maintenance, managing, policing issues – with green space/ open space.
- Greenbelt vs Floodplain – which is better to build/develop?
- Careful how designate open space/recreation areas.
- Need for irrigation in plan - open space.
- Allocations/PO – Used frequently for open space.
- Importance of protecting open spaces.
- Link between economic prosperity and heritage. If value environment – link to economic prosperity – desirable place to live.
- Traditional jobs – now on up – more should be done to help start-up businesses.
- Need for flexible businesses – pub/restaurant.
  → Policy to retain pubs? How to help businesses to be more sustainable.
- Live/work:
  - Need to recognise – prospect of being beyond peak oil.
    → Alternative energies.
    → encourage community facilities to do the same – more flexible planning rules for this e.g. photovoltaics.
- Community facilities – importance of renewable energy – more sustainable.
If planning for 20 years – essential to consider alternative energy and renewable energy.
If building affordable housing – does this affect market prices:
  → Need for low cost.
  → Need for good quality houses.
  → Facilities for old people – access.
  → Importance of market towns.

Group 2

Economic Prosperity

• ↓ car use ↑ public transport (concern over funding 4 P T).
• Promote live/work.
• Jobs – how to get prosperous jobs – not just industrial.
• Working from home – sustainable.
• Knowledge based employment more likely in village (i.e. Work from Home).
• Promote ↑ Broadband speed.
• ↑ cycle lane/footpaths.
• Village road layout/design of development.
• Need for medical facilities in some villages link in with development.
• Infrastructure important.
• Phone coverage needs to ↑ in villages – basics in place to help with running local/work from home businesses.
• Change people’s travel behaviour? People are used to travelling in car – way of life.

Direction of Worcester’s Employment Growth?

• Worcester University – more need for student accommodation?
• ↑ Community facilities and community spirit.
• New villages with facility provision?
• Worcester Parkway Station would ↑ economic prosperity.
• Direct growth to Worcester where all facilities exist.
• Railway halt Fernhill Heath.
• Water supply/sewerage capacity.
• Changes to Severn Trent Water (to properties after 1946) implementing April 2011 – more responsibility to house owner?

Housing Affordability

• Young people on housing ladder and availability of renting.
• Extensions on what was smaller homes – cheaper option rather than moving.
• Groups – Smaller required of affordable housing.
• Public transport.
• No infrastructure.
• Needs to be based on need.
• Be more control of affordable housing and in design terms.
• Parish councils input in allocation of affordable housing.
• ↑ average age in village due to ↓ of affordable housing.
• Facilities – need this to encourage people in a village.
• Genuine affordable homes supply and demand and price.
• Cost of mortgages.
• Need rural schools with allocations.

Group 3

Economic Prosperity

• Appropriate, non-intensive employment in villages e.g. ‘light industrial’
• Each village requires its own consideration.
• Should employment be led by Parish Plans?
  - General ‘Yes’ consensus.
• New residents do not always like traditional farming industries.
• Is there a structure of reporting Parish Plans to Council? Some need updating.
• How villages evolve? Parish Plans could guide this.
• Pershore would welcome employment but no main link i.e. Western link. Infrastructure required up front.

Housing

• Eldersfield: Rates of affordable housing do not reflect rural land values of village, sometimes.
• Can be hard to plan for future when unsure what is happening.
• Is affordable housing necessarily affordable?
• Problem of people extending housing, meaning still have demand for 1/2 bed housing.
• Allowing development on plots that were not meant for e.g. 3 and 4 bed houses. Is an issue?
• Concern affordable housing could attract high numbers to small villages. Levels need to be appropriate to retain local residents especially young and old.
• ‘Building for Life’ standards need to be in policy so implemented.
• Issue of needing development in villages when existing allocations built out with existing Local Plan.
• Smaller sites of e.g. 2/3 would be better than ‘large’ sites.
• Environmental impact e.g. loss of biodiversity needs consideration.

Infrastructure – Community Service Access?

• Upton Snodsbury – NO limited public transport
• Crowle - limited services Eldersfield.
• Church Lench – have not felt loss of services.
• Bredon – local shop does not cater for local need, people go to e.g. Evesham
• Harvington – Doctors needed.
• Youth Club, Doctors required.
• Youth may say they want better bus services? Especially Sunday/evening buses.
• Later bus running times an idea as youth/young cannot get home.
• Pershore – traffic problem due to non-implementation of planned road improvements (Western Link).
• Community transport infrastructure – not across whole of Wychavon at the moment.
• Upton Snodsbury – Youth bus not utilised fully.
- Kempsey – few youth facilities.
- Inadequate road surfacing – need better maintenance.
- Small rural village will need stronger link to health facilities from ageing population – could investigate more. Voluntary transport buses but need to overcome barriers (insurance).
- Infrastructure required before development.
- What infrastructure will be provided up front by developers?
- Sustainability of villages in question in terms of having to travel.

Group 4

Economic Prosperity

- Need lower business rates - subsidised business rates.
- Jobs are the most important thing.
- Need to identify where new jobs coming from.
- Dispersed growth – e.g. from care for elderly and around medical services and tourism - crafts industry.
- Need to look at attracting big industry e.g. Malvern Technology.
- Does Worcester City have to grow?
- Need to work on expansion of Broadband to generate money.
- Do we want small econ sites to grow?
- Proposed small/medium business growth need to source evidence.
- Tewkesbury - Jct 9 growth car driven - not in centre of city clear evidence of small/medium businesses.
- View that motor car needs to be accommodated.
- Is there a need for large employment sites? Should Local Authorities (LA's) take a greater interest in keeping larger employers?
- Recognised that LA's do need to replace Advantage WM Role.
- Jct 9 Tewkesbury transport issues - question over number of employees.
- Need joint Worcs Econ Strategy and Tourism Strategy.
- Need to link Cotswolds - build on existing tourism designations.
- Balance between employment/housing - putting Worcester city out of picture. Does S Worcs want to grow economy to attract growth and balance environment e.g. Group 4 in Cotswolds not detrimental to environment
- Need to create a place for everyone. All scales and to fit in area..
- Need accessible sites.
- Strategy for Jct 5, 6 and 7 of M5.
- Need to build in jobs for local people in developing and growing.
- Jobs for locals - job matching.
- Difficult balancing act - local opinion divided.
- Do we need care homes? Do we need economy growth before we can deliver these
- Need to balance economy.
- Affordable housing for key workers e.g. teachers, nurses, care home workers.
- How to attract landowners to sell land for affordable houses.
- People do not necessarily move for jobs because of job security and where household has two workers.
Housing

- Question re target (RSS) and ONS.
- Housing Disparity between north and south Worcestershire. Why is ours so high?
- Statement that EU level and ageing population challenges meant that people would migrate to Midlands - also economic migrants - however assumptions have now changed.
- Some need (Norton Lenchwick) for market housing to help in an ageing and social housing led area.
- Problem with affordable housing changing at a later date to market housing.
- Need to look at type of housing.
- Issue with commuting for work.
- Need affordable housing for youngsters.
- More low cost housing with new funding streams - general view that homes need to be more affordable.
- Issues over existing settlement boundaries and applications/opportunities for affordable housing.
- Is there scope for allocated housing site where a few market houses subsidise affordable units - needs landowners to agree on allocated affordable?
- Houses need to be near employment.
- Also need for people who want to stay in villages and cannot afford to.
- Mixed use (Affordable, Market and Employment).

Infrastructure

- Market towns have connections to larger towns but villages have very limited public transport (buses).
- Need for circular routes. Timetable issues not available at key times.
- Some consider need to forget public transport, rely on car and widen roads ≠ what about cost? Very expensive.
- Need to subsidise public transport to assist in delivering economic growth.
- Bridges - costs issues. No funding for Pershore and Evesham.
- Need to plan for future need - not now. Funding a massive issue.
- Jct 7 - putting growth there would cause problems for other infrastructure.
- In France get fund for one Hopper bus then Parish Council precept to support delivery.
- Need to feed in Parish Plans.
- Community spirit varies across area.
- Schools - could see loss in some rural areas without growth.
- Easement of village boundary to sustain these.
- Bromsgrove getting rid of community buildings and consolidating - freeing up land for other uses.

Civic Centre Pershore Tuesday 23 November

Group 1

Economic Prosperity

- Any jobs.
- Skilled jobs paying above minimum wage e.g. Technology.
• Loss of existing employment space to residential.
• Important to villages to work from home - Broadband speed.
• Create more 'local' jobs.
• High rents prevent local businesses developing.
• Straight forward mechanism required to enable change of use for business purposes.
• Discourage commuting.
• Encourage young people to stay in villages.
• Village life needs to be maintained.
• Evesham becoming a dormitory town.
• Identify local skills in area attract business accordingly.
• Planning process should be more flexible.
• How do you make villages and small towns attractive to businesses?
  - premises at right price.
• Work force/infrastructure/access.

**Housing**

• Social housing (affordable) for local people.
• More affordable housing for young people/ (all people).
• Good quality rentable accommodation for families (low density).
• Mix of housing.
• Some private housing to give infrastructure/affordable housing.
• How many houses will be sustainable?
• Split larger houses into smaller properties.
• Discourage building social housing and bringing people in from elsewhere
• Build local community.
• Any new build should contribute to infrastructure pot:
  - New build - energy efficient design.
  - New build in villages to contribute to infrastructure required in towns and city.
  - Extensions to existing properties can cause issues - can contributions be collected?
• Parking standards - minimum rather than maximum.
• Growth needs to keep village character.
• Mixture of styles - not identikit?

**Infrastructure**

• Services which reflect age profile of the population.
• More railway halts.
• Funding for infrastructure to enable growth - where from?
  - Tariffs from growth (developer) to fund.
• Local growth = local facilities.
• Tariff for strategic element - high authority?
• Infrastructure to get to facilities in Evesham good.
• Parking issues.
• Public transport - works for schools but not in general.
• Focus on quality of life.
• Rota of specialists (Health) going out to villages (mobile?).
• Lorries in the Vale are destroying the villages of Bretforton and Badsey. This will need to be resolved before more employment is encouraged.
Group 2

Economic Prosperity

- RSS was trying to ensure North would prosper and attract new communities and business.
- Clear support for Brownfield sites.
- Can we ensure that businesses stay in area if granted planning permission (conditions??).
- Many accidents around Junction 5.
- Junction 7 should be a priority for employment given rail links and not Green Belt.
- Support for small-scale local employment.
- Put policies in place for larger businesses to sub-divide.
- Relax policies on rural signage for businesses? Need to find a balance (co-ordination).
- Need to allow business progression locally.
- Support for enterprise centres only if in right location.
- Inkberrow - consider is a good 'sustainable' village but still need some edge of village industrial units.
- Administrative boundaries may limit voice of the community.
- Best way to deal with CIL/S106 monies is for parish/district/county to join forces and discuss.

Housing

- Affordable housing is NOT affordable.
- Could we return to no developers in building local affordable homes? e.g. build in garden for offspring.
- Market not catering for 'downsizers'.
- Need industry to transmit wealth into the community.
- Infrastructure has not kept up with population growth.
- Local schools are oversubscribed and GPs etc. All infrastructure.
- Some villages do not need many houses e.g. one every other year for example.
- Need to be very specific about who qualifies for low cost housing (including sheltered accommodation).
- Need to keep families together - elderly persons' accommodation for local people very important.
- We need to generate communities that look after each other.
- We can insist on a good housing mix.
- Design is now a material planning consideration (since 2000) - PPG3.
- Need stronger regulations on neighbour notification and site notices.
- Develop Brownfield sites first.

Infrastructure

- Concerns that infrastructure under too much pressure and at capacity.
- Infrastructure is an after thought in the planning process.
- Could we have a phasing system to ensure infrastructure is delivered?
- Concerns that small-scale schemes could not contribute to the community → this is changing very shortly.
- Concerns that CIL will not be ring-fenced.
- Problem with so much land under option - being left idle.
- Can we lobby for above land to be looked after?

**Group 3**

**Economic Prosperity**

- Hi-tec/innovative type industries as manufacturing gone abroad:
  - which needs a longer term plan to be effective - e.g. where are the skilled workforce.
- But is this approach realistic?
- Provide starter units: but a lot of failed new enterprises. How will these be funded with demise of Regional Development Agencies?
- Very difficult for Local Authorities to provide economic growth.
- Food production will be very important - include day high intensity uses and packaging important.
- Infrastructure, particularly roads, is a key issue - will it be provided, if not some sites/areas of S Worcs (e.g. Malvern) unsuitable for some uses – e.g. warehousing.
- Technological industries are key - Central Government to be more pro-active.
- Too few Economic Officers in local authorities.
- Concern about e.g. loss of pubs, services, agricultural employment.
- Insufficient Broadband capability for villages especially.
- Should be more supportive of small local businesses and farm diversification.
- Greater policy flexibility for rural areas.
- Tourism important to some villages e.g. Broadway.
- ↓ in rates.
- Loss of employment uses/land in villages to housing is an issue.
- Councils need to be more pro-active in supporting local produce and businesses.
- Businesses such as Bosch have stressed the importance of locating adjacent to the motorway and have broken through the boundary as threatened to move elsewhere.
- Issue of landscape issues/visual appearance seems to carry more weight than encouraging business.

**Housing**

**Rural Areas/Main Towns**

- Most villages because of high development boundaries make house prices unaffordable.
- Interested in 10% growth/village or/parish: spread the load - avoid NIMBYISM: this would lead to a more phased approach.
- Position of affordable housing sometimes inappropriate e.g. Broadway car park - affordable housing land should be made more available.
- 15 years too short term for housing - need to look at 25 years plus; even 50 years.
- If 12,000 on waiting list - this means that 20,000 plus (@40%) would be needed: open market housing.
- Concern about economics of e.g. existing mortgages.
- Two low cost properties (50% of market value): over 40 applicants (Harvington).
- Would like a mix of tenure.
- Concern about allowing affordable in villages where limited or no public transport; utilise off-site contribution/alternative sites in e.g. towns.
- Affordable should be widened to include affordable to purchase - not just social rented.
- Information on waiting list should be treated carefully.
- Shared ownership and local connection are important.
- Do not wish to see people who are not local moving into the affordable housing.
- Re phasing - likely to be slow at first: e.g. money supply.

**Infrastructure**

- Infrastructure takes much longer to implement: 15 years insufficient timescale.
- No certainty over long term provision of infrastructure e.g. Norton Parkway but needs to be accompanied by housing to be viable otherwise services axed e.g. as at Ashchurch.
- Dual track supported.
- Level of development needs to be determined by amount of infrastructure.
- Greater use of rail network e.g. for recycling plants - use of lorries is inappropriate as cannot carry maximum loads.
- More widespread and better broadband needed.
- Infrastructure requires planning and financing over a long period of time - much longer than 15 years.
- Changes in Government lead to severe implications for provision of infrastructure e.g. road building.
- Capacity at schools and hospitals, doctors' surgeries should be a key consideration: developments to include them where possible.

**Rural Towns/Villages**

**Economics:** Therefore suggest have fewer numbers initially.

- Re-use vacant offices for housing → infrastructure already there.
- Need to be more efficient about location of and how waste dealt with.
- Concern about planning legislation preventing effective energy creating systems – e.g. limiting size of solar panels; not allowing ground heating pipes in adjacent fields - needs to be looked at more sympathetically.
- Concerns about some appeal decisions have had detrimental impact on character of area and contrary to local community wishes and seemingly contrary to local policies.
- Need effective communication with local community but often do not get involved unless directly involves them.
How will Parish and Town Councils continue to be involved? Can they perhaps relook/redirect their Village Design Statements and Parish Plans to include say growth of villages?

Additional representations were submitted by Lower Broadheath Parish Council and Newland Parish Council which are summarised below:

Lower Broadheath Parish Council

- Current demographic forecasts do not support the population growth anticipated in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy.
- Wealth creation is needed to support the purchase or renting of additional homes. Economic growth will only be achieved by having a viable infrastructure and by the provision of attractive sites for business development.
- The construction of Worcestershire Parkway, plus dramatically improved existing and additional cross-river links, is considered essential. The ‘Southern-Link’ road has limitations which currently restrict the economic prosperity of South Worcestershire and it will remain overload even following the proposed junction upgrades.
- The proposal resulting from the RSS and SWJCS Preferred Options to allocate 3,500 homes in the parish is totally rejected.
- New small-scale housing and employment growth in the parish is needed for its long-term sustainability.
- The need to preserve the environment and the strategic gap between Worcester and Lower Broadheath is essential in order to retain the rural character of our village. Retaining good quality Grade 2 agricultural land and the amenity of Elgar’s Birthplace are also important.

Newland Parish Council

- Newland residents do not wish to rule out all future development within the parish between 2011 and 2030. However, it was unanimously felt that large scale top down imposed development of both housing and employment land such as that set out in the SWJCS and preserved in the SWDP was inappropriate and should be strongly resisted. Small scale windfall development to serve local needs would be appropriate to meet the development and preservation of the village over that period, and would be supported by the residents of the village.
- Residents consider that no greenfield development at all should take place within the Malvern area under the emerging SWDP. All development should be on brown field sites, and further extensions of the present curtilage of Malvern Town should not take place into the green fields surrounding the town.
- Residents welcome the proposals of the proposed localism bill which shifted the approval of development to parish councils in affected areas rather than at district council level. Residents noted that the Localism Bill proposals will require that any S106 community benefit charge would in future have to be spent only in the parish which was developed and would not be available to the District Council to use outside of the parish. If development was inevitable, residents felt that such S106 contributions could perhaps be used to fund a village hall for Newland?
- Residents were reminded by the parish councillors who had attended the November briefing that the District Council Planning Officers had qualified the proposed Localism Bill by saying that such devolution of power as envisaged by the proposed localism Bill was subject to being overridden by strategic regional
considerations, and that the Newland/Lower Howsell site was a preserved 'Preferred Option'.

- Residents consider it essential that any development within the parish of Newland or adjacent to it can only take place if all necessary infrastructure, both physical and cultural, is in place before any physical development takes place. Residents felt very strongly that no development as proposed in the emerging SWDP should take place regarding the Newland/Lower Howsell site or in or around Malvern without a full dualling of the Southern Link Road, and a substantial upgrade to the railway system. In particular, residents felt that no development should take place at Newland/Lower Howsell without the upgrading of the A449, so as to take all traffic generated by any development away from the existing road system.
- Residents consider the suggestions by the SWDP/SWJCS, that inhabitants of any new housing or users of any developed employment land were likely to primarily use public transport rather than private cars as transport, to be incorrect.
- Residents consider the Green Land Use study documentary evidence base underpinning the SWJCS/SWDP proposals for the Newland/Lower Howsell site to be extremely useful. The revised targets for development were noted and residents noted the adverse impact assessment identified on the village in that study.
- Residents are extremely concerned about the prolonged adverse effects on the village over many years during the building and construction of any development, and on the adverse effect on the quality of life of the existing residents from the very high additional use of road and other services.
- Residents are concerned that any residential development which does occur should be high quality, high status and low density development. Social housing would not be appropriate, but attempts should be made to provide affordable housing for purchase within any development.
- Residents consider that any employment land developed on the Newland/Lower Howsell proposed site should not be used for a retail park or supermarket. Residents consider that employment land provision should be for high end, high tech, high value enterprises only.

Alfrick & Lulsley Parish Council

- Reiterates previous response to SWJCS- sent March 2010
- Good access to services in other villages by private transport, but public transport poor.
- Priorities for facilities are
  - fast/reliable broadband
  - Gas supplies for domestic energy
  - Improved public transport
- Re jobs- need more opportunities to work from home- principal industries are home-working and agriculture. Jobs shouldn’t be directed to villages unless good public transport links
- Should site major commercial and housing development where there are already good transport links- or where they can be economically developed.
- New employment for Worcester should be directed along the M5 corridor and to North and East of Worcester
- Recognition that some development will be required in villages as well as in urban areas.
- Parish Design Statement rules out any multiple dwelling development apart from affordable housing.
• P.C does not need any immediate need for significant development or extension to settlement boundary at this time- although may be need for some development within next 10 years
• If any significant development is required, this should need to provide funding for improvements to community facilities
• PC thinks that a range of 30-50 dwellings in Alfrick is too high.
• SHLAA site responses
  o MHAL1- not now available- village hall extended onto site
  o MHAL2- Some affordable housing now built here- no need for more development of this site
  o MHAL3- Adj to Swan Orchard- considered to be access problems and effect on existing dwellings therefore not appropriate
• Development in open countryside should be resisted
• Protect existing open space around war memorial, playing fields and tennis courts
• Supports protecting buildings of local interest
• Supports protection of local facilities such as shop/ pub/village hall/church
• Maintain footpath network, and important landscape- AONB ( and AGLV- NB Structure Plan policy not saved)
• Protect local employment areas
• No suggestions for gypsy and traveller sites
• Review categorisation of Alfrick village category [NB, VFRTS has been updated]
General Comments
- Generally in favour of further housing and employment development in Martley to maintain the viability of village businesses- Shop/ post Office/Crown PH
- Re Housing Land:
  - Oppose “in-fill” and ribbon development
  - Oppose green field development
  - Support affordable housing- up to 10 units for rent/ shared equity- for those with a connection to the Parish- sites on brownfield or on wasteland e.g.at Hollins Lane, r/o Hastings Close
- Not opposed to other private housing development- say 25-30 dwellings on brownfield near centre of village
- Land nr B4197 to South liable to flash flooding
- Review of potential housing sites:
  - All sites should be deleted as the majority are not realistically achievable
  - Most viable sites are
    - Hollins Lane, r/o Hastings Close- no registered ownership- could deliver up to 5 dwellings
    - Taylor’s Yard- brownfield
- Re Employment land: numerous brownfield sites available in the Parish for light industrial and office units
- Re Infrastructure:
  - Outlying settlements such as Newtown- lack mains sewerage- not suitable for further development- heavy clay soils impede use of septic tanks
  - Existing traffic densities too high on local roads/ lanes- e.g. rat runs
  - Junction of B4204 and B4197 already a problem- further development would exacerbate.
Appendix 4
Parish Plan Summaries
### Parish Plan analysis

**Abberley Parish Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Parish Plan (consultation document) with household survey</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>March 2008 (Survey 2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Draft / emerging</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>Based on 2003 results</td>
<td>108 responses returned out of a possible 270 households.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Malvern Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>70% of respondents would support appropriate affordable housing but only 16% stated a need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing to support local businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84% stated that recreation area was needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td>Unable to determine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td>Rural Housing Enabling Officer recapped the results of the Housing Needs Survey carried out in 2009 at a meeting held on Tuesday 21st September 2010 in the Village Hall. This had indicated a need for 7 rented homes and 6 shared ownership homes and although the survey was done a year ago and circumstances for some may have altered, the Rural Housing Enabling officer stated there was still a need for affordable housing in the village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Development Plans</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>06.12.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>ABBOTS MORTON</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Draft December 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation:              | • Wine and cheese party in June 2004; people were invited to fill in post it notes with their views under various headings.  
  • 148 questionnaires distributed.  
  • 106 replies received; a 72% response rate. | LSP area:                      | Evesham Market Town Partnership/LSP |
| Key issues / priorities that may require a more strategic input: | • Lots of people unable to obtain NHS medical treatment (page 13).  
  • Condition of road surface and potholes (pages 18 & 27)  
  • Dangerous roads, especially speeding at Morton Spirit (pages 19 & 27) | Significant land use issues: | Very little support for development in the parish (page 20), highest level of support (48%) for conversion of redundant buildings. 62% want no development at all.  
  • 75% of respondents want the village to remain unspoilt/retain its character (page 25). |
| Other points of interest: | Parish magazine, ‘Arch Messenger’, is where most residents get local parish information.  
  • Residents Association Bulletin  
  • Village hall newsletter and notice board  
  • Parish Council newsletter  
  • 50% feel facilities for recycling glass bottles are inadequate and should be provided. | Plan analysed by: | Cherrie Mansfield |
| Date:                      | 12 June 2006                      |                                |                     |
### Parish Plan analysis
#### Alfrick and Lulsley Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Parish Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Spring 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>▪ All residents were invited to 'open weekend sessions in the Village Hall in February and September 2004. Comments from over 120 out of some 300 households. The committee followed these sessions up in 2005 with two questionnaires, one specifically for young people which was completed by 123 people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>▪ Malvern Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input: | ▪ **Environment** – Support the Parish Paths Warden scheme by organising local information-gathering procedures. Produce information leaflets to explain; Letts and barter schemes. Pursue opportunities to promote more recycling.  
  ▪ **Highways and Transportation** – consider available traffic calming measures, work with Highways Authority to seek improvements. Investigate and publicise best practice in road safety. Actively promote the availability of public transport.  
  ▪ **Health and other Services** – Ascertain feasibility of extension of Knightwick Surgery to include NHS dental surgery. Explore with emergency services the availability of GPS co-ordinates. Contact the utility company for feasibility and cost of a mains supply.  
  ▪ **Recreation, leisure and communication** – Village Hall committee to continue investigations into relative costs of renovation. Explore and determine feasibility of a community magazine/website.  
  ▪ **Planning and Development** Set up and maintain a planning group of the Parish Council. Maintain links with MHDC Planning and Housing functions. Consider developing a Village Design Statement for MHDC to adopt as a Supplementary Planning Document.  
  ▪ **Young People** Establish a local youth group. Identify suppliers of outdoor equipment. Consult on provision of a bus shelter, lobby for more frequent bus services at weekends, investigate discount fares and travel cards. Information to be displayed. |
| Significant land use issues: | ▪ Alfrick is regarded as the location for future development however falls short of actually stating a need or desire for more housing |
| Other points of interest: | ▪ Plan recognises it needs to support future generations housing needs (results of questionnaire). |
| Plan analysed by: | Development Plans | Date: | 26.11.10 |
Parish Plan analysis
Ashton under Hill Village Plan

The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>ASHTON UNDER HILL</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>April 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Village Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation: | ▪ First stage questionnaire circulated to all households in August 2004, to find out what people felt was good and bad about the village.  
▪ 120 replies received.  
▪ 135 copies of the main survey distributed – at least one to every household – in spring 2005.  
▪ 64 replies received; a 47% response rate.  
| LSP area: | Evesham Market Town Partnership/LSP |
| Key issues / priorities that may require a more strategic input: | ▪ Speeding traffic (pages 10 & 21).  
▪ Poor condition of roads, including mention of some specific problem areas (pages 11 & 21).  
▪ Limited public transport (pages 12 & 21).  
▪ Lack of a village shop (pages 12 & 21).  
▪ Vandalism and security (pages 13 & 21).  
▪ Affordable housing and housing for young people (pages 15 & 22). |
| Significant land use issues: | ▪ Concerned about overhead cables and lack of gas supply to the village.  
▪ High level of support for burying all new electricity and telephone services (page 14).  
▪ Affordable housing and housing for young people (pages 15 & 22).  
▪ Design of new houses – preparing a village design statement containing criteria for development of the village (pages 16 & 22). |
| Other points of interest: | ▪ Village newsletter, Ashton News. Highly regarded as means of disseminating information in the community.  
▪ There is also a parish magazine, which is actively read.  
▪ There is a village information booklet and parish notice board.  
▪ Website: www.ashtonunderhill.org.uk  
▪ Village has set up ‘Garden Organics’, a buying co-operative.  
▪ High support for using a recycling facility if provided – particularly for glass and garden waste. |
| Plan analysed by: | Cherrie Mansfield | Date: | 12 June 2006 |
Parish Plan analysis
Broadway

The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>BROADWAY</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Volunteer organisers of 2005-06 Broadway Parish Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>• Nearly 1,500 ‘open format’ questionnaires distributed to all households. • 710 returned; a 47% response rate. Just under a third of respondents were in the 70+ age range and just 2% were aged 17 – 25. • Initial presentation of results at Open Day in July 2005, attended by 300 people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Evesham Market Town Partnership/LSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues / priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>• Crime – want to see greater police presence (pages 6 &amp; 20) • Public/local transport – specifically links to Cheltenham and Moreton-in-Marsh (pages 6 &amp; 20) • Provision of NHS dental services (page 6) • Facilities and activities for teenagers (page 9) • Empty shops/sustainable economic growth – need for greater number and variety of businesses focused on residents’ needs (pages 11 &amp; 19) • Assistance for home-based workers/businesses (page 12) • Volume &amp; speed of traffic (page 13) • Parking – range of issues (pages 13 &amp; 14) • Affordable housing – although views divided on this (page 15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td>• Affordable housing – views divided on this (page 15) • Want to preserve the character of the village; producing a Village Design Statement (pages 15, 16 &amp; 20) • Residents and traders feel too many development restrictions are in place, whereas local organisations and trusts indicate there aren’t enough restrictions! (pages 15 &amp; 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td>• Noticeboard – but not felt to be well positioned. • New village newsletter. • Village website: <a href="http://www.broadwayvillage.co.uk">www.broadwayvillage.co.uk</a> • Developing a Village Design Statement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Cherrie Mansfield</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>9 August 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish Plan analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cropthorne Parish Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Parish plan:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cropthorne</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date of plan:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Adopted (LIS) 2010</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status of plan:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Final</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prepared by:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Parish Plan Steering Group</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Consultation:** | ▪ Almost 200 questionnaire responses  
▪ Took place in 2007  
▪ All data included in published parish plan |
| **LSP area:** | **Evesham Market Town Partnership/LSP** |
| **Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:** | ▪ Encourage and improve recycling scheme  
▪ Reduce number of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) travelling through village by installing more signs to notify drivers of 7.5 tonne weight restriction.  
▪ Support for neighbourhood watch scheme  
▪ Improve pedestrian access to school (investigate walking bus) |
| **Significant land use issues:** | ▪ Development in village should be proportional to local needs and consider the existing size of the village  
▪ Development should consider the existing provision of infrastructure and the need to improve it if more development is delivered.  
▪ Support for ensuring good design of new development |
| **Other points of interest:** | ▪ There is a parish website where a copy of the parish plan can be downloaded  
▪ Support for improved public transport (investigating options to stop buses in the south of the village) |
| **Plan analysed by:** | **Robert Fowler** | **Date:** | **14.10.10** |
The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation:**
- 279 questionnaires received (out of 417 delivered)
- Exhibition held in the Parish Hall in February 2007, attended by 256 people.
- Updates circulated in the parish magazine (the ‘Crowle Cryer’)

**LSP area:** Droitwich Spa Market Town Partnership/LSP

**Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:**
- Concerns about speeding traffic (60% of respondents complained of this problem)
- Further concerns relate to the roads, specifically potholes and flooding
- Support for retaining existing shops and facilities
- Some concerns about unsuitable parking

**Significant land use issues:**
- 61% of respondents answered no to welcoming new development in the village
- Greatest level of support for the development of affordable houses (28%)
- Support for good and sensitive design of new development

**Other points of interest:**
- The Parish Plan included an action points list and suggested that the Parish Council worked to instigate action groups

**Plan analysed by:** Robert Fowler  **Date:** 14.10.2010
### Parish Plan analysis

**Dodderhill Parish Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Dodderhill</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Adopted 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation:**
- 900+ surveys were sent out to each household in the Parish, the return rate was 40%
- The Parish Plan has sought to engage with the groups responsible for the action points identified (and the 2010 update has suggested that many of the action points have been successfully delivered)

**LSP area:**
Droitwich Market Town Partnership/LSP

**Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input:**
- Concerns about speeding traffic
- Concerns about poor accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists, particularly in the centre of the village (and around the A38/Junction 5)
- Support for environmental improvements to the village green
- Registering of both village greens under the Commons Act (2006)
- Concern about littering, particularly around the fast food outlets associated with the A38/Junction 5 of the M5
- Concern about flooding

**Significant land use issues:**
- 98.5% seek protection of the green belt from development
- 72% of residents oppose development of any kind, with many citing the need to retain the ‘rural feel’ of the village
- 69% do not support the development of the two greenfield sites identified in the adopted Local Plan (2006) as Areas of Development Restraint (ADR) sites.

**Other points of interest:**
- Dodderhill Parish Plan looks at the whole Parish which includes the village of Wychbold
- The Parish Plan has been followed up by a review of the delivered action points in 2010.

**Plan analysed by:**
- Robert Fowler

**Date:**
- 18.10.10
The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan: ECKINGTON</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>August 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by: Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>‘Mad, glad or sad’ survey of all sporting, social and recreational groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gave two groups of teenagers disposable cameras to photograph what made them mad, glad or sad. Comments from pupils at Eckington First School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish questionnaires distributed to every households in November 2003 (497 in total)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283 returned; a 57% response rate. Included 53 responses from under 18s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 250 people attended a Plan Open Day in March 2004 where the results were presented. People attending the day were invited to make comments on a ‘Mad, glad or sad’ board and choose top five issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Pershore Market Town Partnership/LSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues / priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>Speeding traffic (pages 21, 23 &amp; 30) - top priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing (pages 11, 22 &amp; 28) - second priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of sporting facilities/activities (page 8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vandalism (page 12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong support for local school (page 13).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate health facilities/services - e.g. prescription collection service, visiting chiropodist (page 15 &amp; 29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public transport - limited in a southerly direction, e.g. to Bredon, Tewkesbury and Cheltenham (page 19 &amp; 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td>Want future developments to reflect the mix of building and architectural styles in the village (pages 10 &amp; 28).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing (pages 11, 22 &amp; 28) - the second priority for the parish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receptive to a variety of housing types (page 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas where further development could take place, but also areas that should be protected (pages 11 &amp; 24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td>Parish News</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Cherrie Mansfield</td>
<td>Date: 7 June 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Parish Plan analysis

## Eldersfield Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Parish Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survey distributed to 214 households in the summer of 2003. 146 replies were received, 68% response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Hills District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment – tourism should be encouraged, need for more housing, in most case to a very limited degree, 53 households consider they have a major flooding problem in their area. Drainage problems exist in the Poolhay area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing - 43 households identified an affordable housing need within their family, either as a first time buyer or for retirement. Wider understanding of the planning process and principles is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community &amp; Education Over 90% of respondents said that the school was essential for the community. Further out of hours use of the school is needed. There is a lack of awareness of the school hall letting policy and availability of the recreation field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services – A higher visible Police presence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications – Parish magazine for local information. Nearly ½ of the population thought parish information needs improving. 88% of the parish want public telephone boxes retained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Countryside Access – Stiles can be difficult for some walkers; signs could be more informative, there is support for rationalisation of the footpath network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport and road safety – more information on public transport, concern on road safety and speed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning - ensure planning system and process is understood by all parish councillors. Inform and guide residents on the planning system. Consult with MDC to discuss affordable and retirement homes policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious drainage problems exist in the Poolhay area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td>An improvement in 2-way communication between the electorate and the various Councils is needed. The tranquillity and openness of the parish are the two most valued elements. Hedges, small woods and traditional farm buildings that range highest for conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Development Plans</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>06.12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish plan:</td>
<td>Fladbury</td>
<td>Date of plan:</td>
<td>Adopted 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>347 completed questionnaires were received</td>
<td>80% of the Parish completed questionnaires</td>
<td>The majority of respondents were aged between 23 and 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Evesham Market Town Partnership/LSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>Concern about speeding traffic, noise and pollution from the A44</td>
<td>Speed restrictions and safety enhancements around Fladbury Cross (A44)</td>
<td>Support for a 20mph speed restriction near the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td>Just over half of respondents did not support increasing the village settlement boundary</td>
<td>Local opposition to development on the Avon floodplain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td>More than 50% of respondents had lived in Fladbury for at least 15 years which shows a very settled village population</td>
<td>Strong support for the existing footpath network around the Parish with 68% of respondents using it on a weekly or more frequent basis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Robert Fowler</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>19th October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish plan:</td>
<td>Flyford Flavell, Grafton Flyford and Libbery Parish Plan</td>
<td>Date of plan:</td>
<td>Adopted 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>▪ Parish survey and public meeting took place in 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ An open day to discuss outcome of parish surveys took place in June 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Parish plan was available to view in the Three Parishes Hall in May 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Return rate of 59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Separate consultation of Year 4 children at Flyford Flavell First School to gather views of young people in the parishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Pershore Market Town Partnership/LSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>▪ Strong support for local facilities (shop, school and pubs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Some concern about access to health care facilities for those that cannot drive (or are unable to drive because of ill health), support for improved public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Some concern about the use of rural lanes by HGV drivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Support for the improved provision of sports and recreation facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Concerns about traffic and in particular the danger to school children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Support for cycle routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td>▪ Support of preserving rural environment of settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Retain community facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Resist development that is harmful to the environment, in particular to protected species, protected sites and landscape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td>▪ The Parish Plan covers three rural parishes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Robert Fowler</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>19.10.2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parish Plan analysis

**Hampton Lovett and Westwood Parish Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Hampton Lovett and Westwood</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Adopted 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation: | ▪ Survey took place in Spring 2009  
▪ Return rate of 50% |  |  |
| LSP area: | Droitwich Market Town Partnership/LSP |  |  |
| Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input: | ▪ The greatest concern of respondents with regards to roads was with the speed of traffic (59%), particularly on the A442  
▪ There was some support for the improvement of bus services, with the greatest constraint identified as the timetable (38%) |  |  |
| Significant land use issues: | ▪ The Parish Plan action points made specific reference to the need to comment on planning applications and be involved in strategic planning.  
▪  |  |  |
| Other points of interest: | ▪ There are two large industrial estates in the parish, Hampton Lovett and Stonebridge Cross  
▪ Hampton Lovett parish church is a grade I listed building |  |  |
| Plan analysed by: | Robert Fowler | Date: | 22.10.2010 |
Parish Plan analysis
Hanbury Parish Plan

The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>HANBURY 2010</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>2005?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Hanbury 2010 Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation: |  - Parish questionnaire  
  - Public meetings and events  
  - Research | LSP area: | Droitwich Spa Area Partnership |
| Key issues / priorities that may require a more strategic input: |  - Speeding traffic and dangerous driving (pages 3 & 5), with specific dangerous road junctions identified in the plan  
  - Public transport (pages 3 & 11)  
  - Anti social behaviour and theft (or fear of) (pages 5 & 11)  
  - Affordable housing/homes for first time buyers and small family homes and housing association rented accommodation (pages 6 & 14)  
  - Alternatives to a village shop (page 13) | Significant land use issues: |  - Most people don’t want to see the character of Hanbury alter substantially, but recognise need for a better balance of housing types (Page 6)  
  - High proportion of residents want Hanbury to stay as it is (page 6)  
  - Affordable housing/homes for first time buyers and small family homes (pages 6 & 14)  
  - Support for new single dwellings in controlled locations, or small groups of less than ten new homes. But no support for new larger residential development sights (page 6)  
  - Strong support for conversion of redundant buildings (page 6)  
  - No support for small-scale industrial or business development (page 6)  
  - Residents want a say in how the parish will develop and the ability to influence and control future development (page 14) | Other points of interest: |  - Parish newsletter, ‘The Hanbury Herald’  
  - Better publicising of recycling facilities required  
  - Local youth club is well established – possible potential to share experience with other areas struggling to start youth clubs.  
  - Developing a Village Design Statement. | Plan analysed by: | Cherrie Mansfield | Date: | 7 June 2006 |
The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>HILL &amp; MOOR</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>December 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Hill &amp; Moor Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires distributed to every household (277 in total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>182 questionnaires returned; a 65.7% response rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also separate young people's questionnaire: 31 returned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Pershore Market Town Partnership/LSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues / priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>Heavy traffic using Salters Lane &amp; Throckmorton Road and speeding (page 7 &amp; 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing (page 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional games facilities - but need to balance this with size of the parish (pages &amp; 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant concerns about Hill &amp; Moor Landfill site and suggestion of a newsletter to residents (pages 21 – 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Throckmorton airfield – views on future development (page 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities for young people (page 26), suggestion of a youth shelter (page 17). Problem with lack of volunteers to run activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td>Affordable housing (page 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hill &amp; Moor Landfill site – although more to do with site management than planning issues (pages 21 – 23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Throckmorton airfield - views on future development (page 24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td>The Parish Council intends to achieve quality status, but given its size doesn’t anticipate taking on any district council services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53% of residents are connected to the internet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Most residents get information about local activities from the 5Alive magazine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important notices are posted on the parish notice board opposite the Old Chestnut Tree Inn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish website: <a href="http://www.hillandmoor.co.uk">www.hillandmoor.co.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Cherrie Mansfield</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>7 June 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Parish Plan analysis
### Holt Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Parish Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Holt Parish Council with assistance of MHDC, the Countryside Agency and many Parishioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>- Public meeting took place in February 2004, over 50 residents attended. No questionnaire can be found. 40% of the village responded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Malvern Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input: | **Housing** – Development of affordable housing and sheltered housing. Any future development to include a bypass and future development to support local shared primary school. 61% of residents felt that there insufficient homes. However 66% would support affordable housing. 13% stated it would need sheltered accommodation in the near future.  
**Transportation** – Completion of the Worcester orbital by-pass, reduce traffic speeds, bus shelter, better public transport, safe crossing, safe access on foot to Millennium green. 59% of residents said that the volume of traffic at peak times was a major problem, however 74% never use the local bus.  
**Village Environment** – to have a litter free parish, clear policy on street lighting and signage, garden waste to be disposed of in a compliant manner. Maintain roadside hedgerows and footpaths. To achieve 100% recycling in household waste.  
**Recreation and Leisure** – to replace or refurbish village hall, to re-open bridleway No 6, to encourage with educational activities.  
**Community Services** - Provide a range of activities for children, provide evening classes using local expertise, volunteer service to ensure residents who have difficulty accessing various health care services. Village hall as a focal point. 20% have experienced difficulty in accessing hospital, chemist or dentist.  
**Business and Employment** – Ensure business development is in line with local planning regulations, ensure environmental impact on roadside signage is controlled. Adequate training Opportunities, retention of local Post Office. 60% would like a broadband access. |
| Significant land use issues: | Any future development to include a bypass on the east side of the village, any development must include starter homes and or completion of the Worcester Western Orbital Bypass |
| Other points of interest: | Proposed works on Holt Bridge - Experimental work has now been completed and English Heritage consulted. The project is currently out to tender and it is anticipated that the work will start in 2011 and finish in 2012. It's anticipated the weight limit will return to 44 tonnes. |
| Plan analysed by: | Development Plans | Date: | 06/12/10 |
# Parish Plan analysis

**Honeybourne Parish Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Honeybourne</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>19.10.2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 621 questionnaires were delivered, 300 were received completed (a response rate of 48%).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ All of the data from the Parish Plan questionnaires is published</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Evesham Market Town Partnership/LSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Strong support for community facilities in the Parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Request for greater sports facilities in the village (particularly tennis courts and football)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Three quarters of respondents would be keen to see films in the village hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Speeding through the village identified as the greatest concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ There was interest from the majority of respondents to restart the village carnival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 76% of respondents were in favour of a small development of affordable housing for local need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The village was originally made up of two halves that fell partly in Worcestershire and partly in Gloucestershire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The village benefits from two shops, two pubs, a school and a mainline railway station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Robert Fowler</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>19.10.2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parish Plan analysis
Inkberrow Parish Plan

The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>INKBERRROW</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>November 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation: | ▪ Launch event, leading to ...
▪ Questionnaires distributed to every household (approx. 800 in total)
▪ 26% questionnaires returned |
| LSP area: | Pershore Market Town Partnership/LSP |
| Key issues / priorities that may require a more strategic input: | ▪ **Purpose built health centre** - making sure it goes ahead (pages 5 & 17)
▪ **Affordable housing** particularly for young people and small family homes, small purpose built **sheltered housing** (pages 7 & 18) – small scale developments, using redundant buildings, restricting sale to local residents
▪ **Traffic**, speeds and danger spots, particularly the A422/B4092 junction - want to reduce speed through the village and create a safer junction at Holberrow Green (pages 10 & 20)
▪ Regular **public transport** service, especially for older residents/awareness of what’s currently available (page 11)
▪ Lack of **facilities and activities for young people** (pages 5 & 15) – the plan contains various suggestions such as a village youth worker, skate park
▪ **Vandalism** (pages 8, 15 & 19) |
| Significant land use issues: | ▪ Any development is in keeping with the rural nature of the area.
▪ Affordable housing particularly for young people and small family homes, small purpose built sheltered housing (pages 7 & 18) – small scale developments, using redundant buildings, restricting sale to local residents |
| Other points of interest: | ▪ Large number of residents feel that the ‘quiet lanes’ are a waste of time
▪ ‘What’s On’ free village magazine, produced and delivered by volunteers
▪ Parish council and WI notice boards
▪ Parish web address: [www.inkberrow.org.uk](http://www.inkberrow.org.uk) |

Plan analysed by: | Cherrie Mansfield | Date: | 7 June 2006 |
### Parish Plan analysis
**Kempsey Parish Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Parish plan and Report one year on.</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>2005 Update 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Kempsey Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>• 1371 people completed questionnaire.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 400 people attended the two Parish open days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Delivered to all 1325 households in the parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Malvern Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>Housing Maintain the settlement boundary as in the Malvern Hills District Local Plan. Ensure that the strategic gap is preserved by reviewing all proposals for activity within the defined area. Recognise some further development must take place especially low cost housing but only with the settlement not outside the boundary. These should be available to rent. Large housing are considered undesirable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Countryside – Establish clear guidelines on dealing activities that impinge on the Common and Hams. Review the emerging local transport strategies with reference to accessibility of the hospital. Form a long term plan to improve lighting, fencing and general amenity of areas. Promote the establishment of parts of Hatfield Brook as a Wildlife Corridor, with the help of Worcestershire Wildlife Trust. Consult with district, county authorities and Police on parking, speeding, litter. Lobby the local MP on measures and a timescale to reduce noise from the M5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills and Business – Oppose the development of businesses involving the use of heavy vehicles in the narrow lanes of the Parish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure – seek sources of funding to permit investment in improving the open spaces in the Parish. Seek funding for play equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth &amp; Education – Funding to be sought and planning issues to be investigated by the Parish Council for new outdoor facilities for older children at the playing fields. Funding to be sought and planning issues to be investigated for facilities at Kings Hill and Kerswell Green.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality of Life and policing – Improved footway lighting. Slow vehicle speed on A38.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability, dependency and healthcare – Pavement lengthening and improve pavement surfaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish Council – Consider the long term feasibility of providing a new purpose built Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Significant land use issues: | - Significant Gap  
- Settlement boundary  
- Quality and performance of local sewers continues to be a concern to many residents.  
- Flooding |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Other points of interest: | - **Skills and business.** Establish a directory of businesses and services operating in, and for Kempsey.  
- **Leisure** Establish a directory of sport, hobby and social clubs. Maintain footpaths and bridleways, encourage the planting of trees, bulbs and shrubs.  
- **Quality of Life and Interest** Crime figures of the parish could be published regularly. Encourage Neighbourhood Watch.  
- **Disability, dependency and healthcare** Survey pavement surfaces and dropped kerbs. Survey shops and other facilities for access via ramps.  
- **Parish Council** Investigate appointing a litter and community warden. Publish the Parish Plan and create a website. |
| Plan analysed by: | Development Plans | Date: | 06.12.10 |
**Parish Plan analysis**  
*Leigh and Bransford Parish Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Parish Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>April 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>667 questionnaires distributed.</td>
<td>469 responded, 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Malvern Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input:**

- **Policing**  
  Publish regular updates, address localised anti-social behaviour by referring to the appropriate authorities.

- **Housing and Development**  
  To undertake a regular Housing Survey, to identify potential development sites for a modest rolling programme of small affordable housing developments within the parish.  
  Ensure any new housing promotes good design, both to ensure that the character of the parish is retained and to promote energy efficiency.  
  To ensure that any new housing is restricted to individuals and families with a local connection.  
  Of those with an opinion on new housing, more shared ownership was preferred by 61%.  
  The lack of affordable housing was also highlighted by local businesses as one of the reasons for problems in attracting staff.

- **Organisations and Amenities**  
  Support the existing pubs and hotels.  
  Support any innovative ideas which promote social interaction.

- **Memorial Hall**  
  Support any improvements.

- **Sporting and play areas**  
  Advertise the existing local sporting facilities more widely.  
  Make the provision of a young children’s play area a condition of any future development in Leigh Sinton.

- **Highways, foot and cycle ways**  
  Consider the question of street lighting on the two main roads in Leigh Sinton.  
  Keep the situation of all the highway danger points under review.  
  Notify highway authorities of any trees or hedges encroaching on roads.  
  Report any new flooding problems.  
  Ensure that any changes to the Malvern Road – A4103 junction are integrated with consideration of the Stocks Lane – A4013 junction.  
  Explore the possibility of establishing cycle ways and pavements from Leigh Sinton to both Malvern and Bransford and a cycle way from Leigh Sinton to the Memorial Hall.

- **Public Transport**  
  There was an extremely positive response to the suggestion that an edge of parish railway be opened with 75% saying that they would definitively or possibly use it.  
  **Action**: to bring the survey findings relating to train reliability to the attention of the rail service providers.  
  To bring the survey findings relating to establishing an out-of-parish railway station to organisations.  
  To press for a detailed transport survey.

**Significant land use issues:**
**Other points of interest:**

- **Shops** Leigh Sinton Post Office stores is a vital amenity, and should be supported in any development. Support Bransford Garage in maintaining and developing the site, particularly the stores. Use all local stores and services as much as possible.
- **Facilities for Senior Citizens** Support the Memorial Hall Committee
- **The Environment and Housing** Promote more planting, identify old orchards, provide more litter bins, promote education within schools about disposing of rubbish.
- **Public Transport** Ensure that bus timetables are displayed on notice boards and on the Parish Council’s web site. Promote the three parishes Sphere bus service. Collaborate with neighbouring parishes to improve common services. Survey the use of existing bus services. Monitor schemes for elderly and disabled people. Approach Leigh Sinton school regarding a walking bus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan analysed by:</th>
<th>Development Plans</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06.12.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Parish Plan analysis

## Little Comberton Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Little Comberton</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Adopted 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                 | ▪ 181 people completed the survey out of 290 people living in the Parish (approximately 63% of the village)  
|                 | ▪ 5% of respondents were aged 11 to 17               |
| LSP area:       | Pershore Market Town Partnership/LSP                |
| Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input: | | | |
|                 | ▪ Strong support for preserving wildlife and in particular hedgerows and old orchards  
|                 | ▪ Two thirds of respondents were disturbed by speeding traffic  
|                 | ▪ Concern was also raised about the number of HGVs travelling through the village  
|                 | ▪ Support for enhanced bus provision  
|                 | ▪ Concern about car parking  
|                 | ▪ Support for increased police presence               |
| Significant land use issues: | | | |
|                 | ▪ A third of respondents were not in favour of any development  
|                 | ▪ Concern by 51% of respondents that recent developments had not been ‘in keeping’ with the village. |
| Other points of interest: | | | |
|                 | ▪ 8% of the households in the village do not have a car  
|                 | ▪ The Parish Plan requested a green waste collection from Wychavon District Council that has subsequently been rolled out to all communities in the District.  
|                 | ▪ 8% of respondents had lived in the village all their lives |
| Plan analysed by: | Robert Fowler | Date: | 19.10.2010 |
Parish Plan analysis
Little Witley Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Parish Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>2008/9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation:        | • Meeting held in March 2007.  
|                      | • Questionnaires were delivered to all households.  
|                      | • 80% response       |
| LSP area:            | Malvern Hills        |
| Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input: | Employment and Training – Investigate training opportunities, provide job information, consider childcare and transport issues. Support any action to open a shop/garage within the local area.  
|                      | Planning and Housing Parish Council, in capacity as consultee in planning process, liaising with MHDC. Parish Council will continue to represent local concerns. Limitation on housing development to dwellings controlled locations. Need to improve surface water drainage and investigation into installation of mains gas and sewerage.  
|                      | Transport and Highways – Consider traffic calming measures, compile a list of dangerous sites. Meet with West Mercia Police and County Council. Investigate the possibility of a transport pooling scheme.  
|                      | Emergency and Other Services – Improvement in the Neighbourhood Watch scheme, meet with West Mercia Police to discuss ways of improving service. Maintain and improve communication network.  
|                      | Sport, Recreation and Leisure – Initiate a feasibility study for children.  
|                      | Education – Provide a list of childcare providers. Research possibility of expanding provision within the local area, local provision for a holiday play scheme.  
|                      | Local Government and Communication – Ensure full distribution of Parish Council news, including outcome of decisions and schedules of meetings.  
|                      | Environment – Carry out survey to assess litter, maintenance of footpaths, banks and verges.  
|                      | Shopping – Support the owners of the Post Offices to publicise their products and services.  
| Significant land use issues: |  
| Other points of interest: | Parish will support one off “single modestly sized dwellings to accommodate local people”.  
| Plan analysed by:    | Development Plans     | Date:         | 06.12.10 |
## Parish Plan analysis
### Lower Broadheath Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Lower Broadheath Parish Plan Update</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>October 2007 &amp; Update in 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Adopted by PC on 7 June 2010</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Lower Broadheath Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial Consultation in village 2005- 20% of questionnaires returned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow up May 2005- 7% of forms returned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January 2010 survey- 22% responses rate (158 residents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malvern Hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>Large Scale Development of 3,500 homes or more- continue to fight this issue, object to emerging LDF, force Worcester city to use all developable land within city boundaries first, demand completion of North West Orbital Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable Housing- pursue provision of small scale affordable housing development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport- Complete North West Orbital Road. Refuse all significant planning applications until transport improvements are carried out. Improve bus services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Health- No change to school catchment areas- don’t ‘bus-in’ children from new developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment- need for more employment in the parish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure- additional facilities likely not justified, though with new development in other villages additional facilities may be made available at Martley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development pressure from Worcester city growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boundary Change- if major development forced upon Lower Broadheath, change boundary so that it falls within Worcester City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish plan update- includes SWHAG New Vision document, and responses to SWJCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>06.12.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Parish Plan analysis**

**Newland Parish Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Newland Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation: | ▪ In the summer of 2003 a questionnaire was distributed to 145 households. 70% responded.  
▪ In November 2003, the results of the survey were analysed and presented to a public meeting attended by 60 parishioners. |
| LSP area: | Malvern Hills |
| Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input: | ▪ **Housing** – Whilst some support for the consideration of affordable housing, most residents felt that any further development would be detrimental to the village.  
▪ **Retail** – Deliveries to all parts of the village are limited.  
▪ **Health** – Residents support the general initiatives to improve health services locally.  
▪ **Education** – There are few children living in the parish. Comments received comments related primarily to transport issues.  
▪ **Work** – Some concern was expressed about rural business and its impact on the environment.  
▪ **Roads** – roads and traffic were the dominant factors in the survey. Major issues are: improved and safer access to the A449 from the Swan, Madresfield Road and Monksfield Lane junctions, safer crossing facilities to the bus stops, speed reduction, improvements to pavements and more reliable public transport.  
▪ **Utilities** – Interruptions in the electricity supply are frequent.  
▪ **Environment** – the upkeep of verges, ditches and ponds |
| Significant land use issues: | ▪ |
| Other points of interest: | ▪ Communications It was suggested more information be published in a and the Parish Council consider other ways of improving information flow, from electronic communication to the publishing of a newsletter. |
| Plan analysed by: | Development Plans | Date: | 18.10.10 |
## Parish Plan analysis
### Ombersley and Doverdale Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Ombersley and Doverdale</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Adopted 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status of plan:</strong></td>
<td>Final</td>
<td><strong>Prepared by:</strong></td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Consultation:** | ▪ Questionnaire was circulated to all 856 homes in the Parish  
▪ There were 303 responses (35% of the village) |
| **LSP area:** | Droitwich Spa Market Town Partnership/LSP |
| **Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:** | ▪ Strong support for the re-introduction of the post office in the village  
▪ Support for reducing traffic passing through the village to use the bridge over the Severn (at Holt)  
▪ Speeding through the village is a key concern  
▪ Some concern for over-grown hedges and verges  
▪ Concern about HGVs (though this may be less of an issue now due to 7.5 tonne weight restriction on the bridge at Holt) |
| **Significant land use issues:** | ▪ 53% of respondents were in favour of more housing in the village  
▪ 23% of respondents suggested that they had relatives who were effected by affordability problems in the village  
▪ 42% of respondents considered that if more houses were built in the village this could help solve affordability problems |
| **Other points of interest:** | ▪ Respondents asked for improved recycling collection which has subsequently been carried out by Wychavon District Council  
▪ Ombersley benefits from a good range of village facilities, including a bakery, butcher, shop and pubs  
▪ With 2178 people, Ombersley is one of the larger parishes in terms of population |
| **Plan analysed by:** | Robert Fowler | **Date:** | 19.10.2010 |
## Parish Plan analysis
### Ripple Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Ripple Parish Council Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Autumn 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final (update on 2001)</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>RPC Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Surveys were delivered to 590 properties in May 2008. 430 adult questionnaires (73%) and thirty-seven young people’s questionnaires returned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Flooding</strong> – land drainage issues, flood defences, Community Emergency Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Planning Decisions</strong> – Maintain rural environment, limit all development, enforcement of planning conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Security and Traffic</strong> – Neighbourhood Watch, Police presence, enforce speed limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recycling</strong> – Maintain current MHDC service, provision of skips, energy conservation awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leisure facilities</strong> – Footpath use and maintenance, childrens play facilities, provide cyclepaths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Strong view not to build houses – very poor opinion of MHDC planning department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to Development Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No specific mention for affordable housing or local housing needs;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ No specific mention of number of dwellings;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Development Plans</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>19.10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Plan analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushwick Parish Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Rushwick Parish Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Autumn 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Rushwick Parish Council &amp; volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Public Meeting October 2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Questionnaire January 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Malvern Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Housing</strong>- cease further village expansion, provide affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Transport</strong>- Stop through traffic and speeding, discourage on-road/inappropriate parking, improve public transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Recreation</strong>- shortage of amenities for young people. Modernise village hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ <strong>Environment</strong>- Recycling facilities, dog fouling. Maintain and keep open spaces within village boundary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Village expansion concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Shortage of recreation facilities within village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Development Plans</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>06.12.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Parish Plan analysis
### Sedgeberrow Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Sedgeberrow</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Adopted 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires delivered to all 337 properties in Sedgeberrow (April 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>211 completed questionnaires received (62% of the village)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Evesham Market Town Partnership/LSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>Support for more activities in the village hall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for providing more/improved sports facilities in the village (in particular, tennis courts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong support for recently re-opened shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82% of respondents to the questionnaire suggested that all attempts should be made to improve flooding issues in the village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72% of respondents requested improved green waste recycling (this has now been delivered by Wychavon District Council)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern about traffic dangers in the village, particularly around the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td>63% of respondents want affordable starter homes in the village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Parish Plan suggests that the majority of residents have concerns about industrial development in the village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td>20% of the population of the village are over the age of 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 households were affected by the July 2007 floods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Robert Fowler</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>20.10.2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parish Plan analysis
Shrawley Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Shrawley Parish Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>- The Parish Survey was distributed to 149 dwellings in November and December 2003. 110 responses (74%).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Malvern Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Environment – (Natural) the skyscape, Shrawley woods, hedgerows, trees, more roadside bulbs, (Built) Prevention of light pollution. Improvement of unsightly locations. (Drainage &amp; sewage) – Lack of mains sewers, excess surface water, need for cesspits/septic tanks to work effectively. (Litter) Litter along the B4196. effective recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transport and Highways – Various road danger spots (especially on the B4196). Public bus services,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning and Housing – Development needs to be appropriate and proportionate. Lack of low cost housing. Business Development needs to be sited appropriately. On road parking is a hazard. Unscreened high walls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shopping No local shops in the village. Need to enhance the village hall facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education, employment and training Need to ensure the retention of the local nursery school in Shrawley and schools at Astley and Great Witley. Encouragement of small businesses and working from home. Need to encourage local adult education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sport, Recreation and Leisure – Significant investment still needed in the village hall, lack of recreational facilities and open space for older children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant land use issues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of low cost housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hazardous on road parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drainage and Sewage issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other points of interest:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Church fabric is need of constant repair. The church building and external lighting need to be enhanced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of local Police service, difficulties in collecting prescriptions, access to Worcester Royal Hospital, no first responder/local emergency service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Plan analysed by: | Development Plans | Date: | 19.10.10 |
**Parish Plan analysis**  
**Stock & Bradley Parish Plan**

The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan: STOCK &amp; BRADLEY</th>
<th>Date of plan: 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan: Final</td>
<td>Prepared by: Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation: | Questionnaire distributed to every household in the two villages and properties within adjoining parishes that are within the rural settlements of the two villages (approx. 175 in total).  
No information in the plan about response rate.  |
| LSP area: | Droitwich Spa Area Partnership |
| Key issues / priorities that may require a more strategic input: |  
- **Speeding traffic & road safety** (page 6), support for adjusting the speed limit  
- More opportunities for **adult education** (page 13)  
- **Activities for children and young people**, some specific suggestions made (page 13)  
- **Loss of village shop and post office**, suggestions for a drop-in centre in village hall offering refreshments, selling basic provisions, stamps and assisting with collection of prescriptions (page 15)  |
| Significant land use issues: |  
- **Some** support for conversion of redundant buildings and for single dwellings in controlled locations and for sensitive infill housing within the village envelope (page 11)  
- Overwhelming rejection of proposals for larger groups of houses (page 11)  
- Overall reluctance to change (page 12)  
- Review of parish boundary to redefine it to include all the houses in the village (page 18).  |
| Other points of interest: |  
- Two parish noticeboards – well used  
- Want to extend glass recycling to Stock Green.  
- Proposals to establish a parish website.  |
| Plan analysed by: | Cherrie Mansfield | Date: 7 June 2006 |
### Parish Plan analysis

#### Suckley Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Suckley Planning for Real</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Council and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>▪ In November 2000, a Community Consultation event was held in the Parish of Suckley. The event was attended by 54 members of the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>▪ Malvern Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input: | ▪ **Transport** – Concern over speed volume and safety of traffic passing through the Parish. Drainage was an issue and there were also concerns relating to the road bridge into Longley Green being an accident hot spot.  
  ▪ **Local Environment** Key points related to the provision of bins at the local playing fields. Planting of trees in avenues along the entrances into Longley Green was also suggested.  
  ▪ **Leisure** - Formation and provision of a cricket team and activities such as badminton and yoga.  
  ▪ **Crime and safety** – The majority of the requests were of presence of police foot patrols. Formation of Neighbourhood Watch Schemes and traffic calming.  
  ▪ **Housing** – Drainage was the most commonly occurring issue. There was also a wide range of issues relating to the quality of the current housing stock on New Road estate.  
  ▪ **Community Facilities** – Keep the Primary School open.  
  ▪ **Health** – two people requested a blood donor service. |
| Significant land use issues: | ▪ |
| Other points of interest: | ▪ |
| Plan analysed by:   | Development Plans          | Date:         | 19.10.10 |
Parish Plan analysis
Tenbury Wells and Burford Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Tenbury and Burford Parish Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>March 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Tenbury Town Council &amp; Burford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation: | ▪ Consultation carried out between March and August 2003.  
  ▪ Youth: 180 questionnaires to school and café. 115 returned.  
  ▪ Household – 1969 questionnaires 723 returned (36.7%).  
  ▪ Businesses – Survey distributed to 60 businesses and 30 were returned. Visitors – Survey, 25 were returned. |
| LSP area: | ▪ Malvern Hills |
| Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input: | ▪ **Shopping** – Work with Chamber of Trade on opening hours. Work with Worcestershire Farmers Markets Association to develop a farmers market in the town. Work with MHDC to attempt to secure funding to provide a town centre enhancement scheme.  
  ▪ **Access** – Town Council to continue to implement accessibility improvements, work with MHDC to try and secure funding for improvements to commercial premises. Investigate sources of advice for businesses with regards to the Disability Discrimination Act.  
  ▪ **Tourism** – Work with partner organisations to develop a Tourism Promotion Strategy. Town and Parish Council seek funds for introduction of flowering shrubs/signage. Tenbury Town Council are working with MHDC to improve Riverside and Kyre Brook.  
  ▪ **Leisure** – More indoor and outdoor recreational facilities for the whole community. Tenbury Town Council to continue to support improvements to the play area and skateboarding facilities. Town and Parish Council to work with all relevant agencies to investigate the possibility of the river as a location for leisure pursuits.  
  ▪ **Land Use and Environment** – Work with the Conservation officer at MHDC to under consistent monitoring of the historic built environment. Set up an Action Group to produce a Design Statement. Work with the Environment Agency to ensure continued high environmental significance of the River Teme.  
  ▪ **Housing** In favour of small affordable housing scheme. Ongoing discussions to ensure local housing needs are incorporated into local planning policy. Town Design Statement to be produced to investigate the local design and locations needs. Work with Local Authorities to develop affordable homes policy providing and retaining accommodation for local people.  
  ▪ **Traffic and Transport** Investigate the possibility of extending the discounted parking scheme for non Tenbury residents. Set up a working group to carry out a Traffic Management Study of the town. Promote existing transport schemes. Signpost A4112 unsuitable for Heavy Goods Vehicles at Leominster end of the road. Investigate if people would use public transport. Tenbury Town Council and Burford Parish Council to continue pressure to improve bus services. Promotion of local transport schemes. |
Significant land use issues:

- Monitoring of the Historic Built environment. Environmental significance of River Teme
- Concern about new developments

Other points of interest:

- **Business and Employment** Report crime and security concerns to local police. Campaign to promote existing schemes to support employment and access to job centres. Promote existing childcare and playschemes. Investigate with local partners the availability of employment and Modern Apprenticeship opportunities.
- **Crime** Report findings of the Parish Plan to the area Crime Risk managers, local Police and SSDC Community Safety Partnership.
- **Health** – Pressure to try and have an ambulance located closer to Tenbury and Burford
- **Services** – Town and Parish Councils to monitor standards of verge maintenance and report any inadequacies. To work with County Councils for improvements to roads and pavements.

| Plan analysed by: | Development Plans | Date: | 30.11.10 |
## Parish Plan analysis
### Upton Snodsbury Parish Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Upton Snodsbury</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>Adopted 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation: | - 100 households responded to a parish survey (67% of the parish)  
- Of the 100 households, the responses came from a total of 168 people  
- 38 young people responded (age 4-14) |
| LSP area: | Pershore Market Town Partnership/LSP |
| Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input: | - 53% of respondents suggested that littering in the village was a concern  
- Strong support for local shop (99% of respondents claim they use it, 69% on a regular basis)  
- 51% of households experienced problems with their electricity supply (power cuts and disconnections)  
- 63% of respondents expressed an interest in improved sports facilities in the village  
- 41% of respondents suggested that the village needed a better bus service (with the majority wanting an improved service to Worcester)  
- 65% of respondents were concerned about speeding in the village |
| Significant land use issues: | - 67% of respondents oppose development outside of the built up area of the village  
- 24% of respondents supported the development of smaller homes |
| Other points of interest: | - Only 7% of respondents to the parish survey had lived in the village for less than 2 years  
- There is a magazine circulated to all households in the parish (‘The Bowline’) |
| Plan analysed by: | Robert Fowler | Date: | 21.10.2010 |
### Parish Plan analysis

**Upton upon Severn Parish Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>Upton upon Severn Town Plan</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>October 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Town Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consultation: | ▪ 1484 questionnaires were delivered to households in 2004.  
▪ 415 questionnaires were completed.  
▪ Town/Parish Plan Review 2007 |
| LSP area: | Malvern Hills |
| Key issues /priorities that may require a more strategic input: | **Transport and Road Systems** - (Bus Services) Suggest regular bus services to Malvern, Worcester, Tewkesbury, Pershore and Evesham. A late evening service to/from Worcester, a bus/rail link. (Parking). Suggest one way system In New Street. One side of every street should be no parking. More free parking. (Traffic) – 66% felt that a pedestrian crossing was needed in the High Street, 75% felt that the town would benefit from a bypass.  
▪ **Trade and Tourism** – Majority felt there was a wide enough shops. Majority believed that Upton benefits from tourism, 53% felt that tourists has enough to see and do. Suggestions: improvements to pavements/shopfronts, better quality shops, controlled parking, formal gardens, pedestrianised riverfront boat trips, cycle routes.  
▪ **Recreation and Education** Majority felt that the balance of recreational facilities was not right. 55% felt the play areas were sufficiently equipped. Not enough part time-evening courses.  
▪ **Riverfront and Public** 80% agreed that the riverfront should be improved and enhanced. 59% felt that the riverfront was easily accessible. 33% were worried about flooding and wanted more advice. Suggestions for additional services were: night time security foot patrol, NHS dentist.  
▪ **Development** 59% did not feel there was scope for further housing. If affordable housing was to be provided - 62% felt that should be lower cost housing, 17% - shared equity housing and 8% -Housing Association properties. |
| Significant land use issues: | Limited scope for further housing  
▪ Traffic considered a major problem |
| Other points of interest: | The survey results were analysed and it was felt that there should be further consultation with the young people of Upton. Therefore a Youthcase Event was organised. |
| Plan analysed by: | Development Plans | Date: | 19.10.10 |
Parish Plan analysis
Wyre Piddle Parish Plan

The issues highlighted will help inform the priorities for the next Wychavon community plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish plan:</th>
<th>WYRE PIDDLE</th>
<th>Date of plan:</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of plan:</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Parish Plan Steering Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation:</td>
<td>Questionnaire distributed to every household in the village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67 replies received; a 25% response rate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exhibition held in January 2005; 166 people attended and were invited to give their views.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSP area:</td>
<td>Pershore Market Town Partnership/LSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key issues/priorities that may require a more strategic input:</td>
<td>Speeding traffic &amp; road safety issues (pages 15 &amp; 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safer routes for pedestrians &amp; cyclists (pages 18 - 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Affordable housing (page 22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training and leisure interest courses (page 25), including IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village hall – improvements/rebuild and greater use (page 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sports/playing field (page 28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desire to set up a Youth Club (page 29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals for the development of the Hill &amp; Moor Landfill site and Throckmorton airfield (pages 50 – 54 and 57 – 61).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant land use issues:</td>
<td>Affordable housing (page 22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No new housing developments built outside the Development Boundary or within the Strategic Gap except in exceptional circumstances (page 23).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No in-filling unless significant benefit to the village - e.g. affordable housing or enhancement of amenities (page 23).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporation of 106 agreements in any new large housing developments (page 23).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simms and Wood’s land could meet aspirations such as affordable housing, new village hall and sport/playing field (page 43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Plan contains maps and designs showing many of the proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contains proposals for the future development of the Hill &amp; Moor landfill site once it is returned to green field status (pages 50 – 54).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contains a range of proposals for the development of Throckmorton Airfield (pages 57 – 61).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other points of interest:</td>
<td>There are a number of noticeboards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish newsletter produced approximately quarterly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Five Alive’ monthly magazine published by the Church of England Parish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parish Council is considering setting up a website.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourhood Watch scheme covers 75% of the village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbourhood Link service recently set up – members of the team acts as friends to the neighbours in their area, providing help, transport, etc. if needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan analysed by:</td>
<td>Cherrie Mansfield</td>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>2 August 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>