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A vision for 2026...

Making spaces into places
For us all, not just the few.
Jobs and shops and education.
Preserve the old, create the new.

Houses that don’t cost the earth,
Farmland and wild woodland too.
Countryside and town together
What’s your vision, what’s your view?

Streets and parks to walk and cycle,
Trains and buses, footpaths too.
Transport links that help the climate -
Do these things matter to you?

Information is available from:
• www.swjcs.org
• www.makingspacesintoplaces.com
• Customer service centres and libraries
• Or ask for a leaflet by emailing
  contact@swjcs.org, or tel 01905 722233

The South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy
Public events coming to a place near you soon
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1. SETTING THE SCENE

Introduction

1.1 This consultation report sets out the methods of consultation undertaken between November and December 2007 to accompany the publication of the Issues and Options Paper, the first stage in preparing the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy. The report explains who, how and when we consulted, as well as providing details of the pre Issues and Options consultation and the overall communications strategy put in place to raise awareness of the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy. The Joint Core Strategy is being prepared in partnership by Malvern Hills and Wychavon District Councils and Worcester City Council in accordance with Section 28 of The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. This means that each local authority remains responsible for its own planning decision making, but has entered into informal arrangements to work together on cross-boundary planning matters.

1.2 The Issues and Options Paper was published for the statutory six week consultation on 2 November and ended on 14 December, although submissions were accepted up to 21 December 2008. This consultation forms part of that required by Regulation 25 of The Town and Country Planning Local Development Regulations 2004. The consultation was undertaken in accordance with the timetable contained in each of the three local authorities Local Development Schemes for the Local Development Framework adopted in April 2007.

1.3 In addition, the process has adhered to the consultation methods set out in the three local authorities adopted Statements of Community Involvement. An overarching Consultation and Communications Strategy was also put in place to agree a common approach to consultation between the three partner authorities.

1.4 Unless provided in the appendix, all the referenced documents in this report can be found on the website for the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy www.swjcs.org.

Local Development Framework

1.5 Planning affects the homes we live in, place of work, the open spaces we enjoy, the leisure facilities we use and how we move about. Those decisions affect how we live our lives, the types of communities we live in, services we use, e.g. shops, schools, hospitals or open spaces and historic buildings. In short, these decisions affect every aspect of our lives.

1.6 Recent legislation has made a number of significant changes to the planning system at all levels of governance in England, from regional and county tiers through to the local planning authority. As individual local authorities, all three Council are required to produce a range of planning documents that comprise each Local Development Framework. This is a statutory requirement and in preparing these plans a formal procedure must be followed (see Fig. 1).

Fig. 1 Key steps in preparing the Local Development Framework

1. Preparing an information base on key aspects of social, economic and environmental characteristics
2. Prepare and publish Issues and Options report
3. Prepare and publish Preferred Options report
4. Prepare the submitted version of the Joint Core Strategy to Government for independent examination
5. Examination in Public
6. Publication of binding Inspector’s Report and adoption of Joint Core Strategy

1.7 This would have included a Core Strategy for each local authority, however the planning legislation provides opportunity for joint working particularly where there are strategic planning issues that will impact ‘cross-boundary’. The need for Malvern Hills and Wychavon Districts to accommodate a significant proportion of Worcester City’s housing growth (due to the latter’s restrictive administrative boundaries) led the three authorities to agree to work together in
December 2006 and produce a Joint Core Strategy. This will replace in part the three adopted Local Plans by 2010 and the 2001 Worcestershire County Structure Plan as it applies to South Worcestershire. The Joint Core Strategy includes a range of strategic planning policies covering housing, jobs, travel, shopping, recreation and the environment. The document must also be ‘spatial’ in that it contains a ‘vision’ for the area, supports the Community Strategy themes, and assist with the delivery of other key service providers, e.g. NHS future service delivery plans.

1.8 Key to the planning system is early, effective and meaningful consultation with the wider community as well as specific interested parties and key service providers. This involvement from the beginning assists in producing a plan that reflects, as far as possible, community aspirations and needs by allowing issues to be identified and policy responses considered. Of course regional and national planning policies or guidance, and a range of other constraints also influences the content of the plan. Other constraints also need to be taken into account, such as physical and landscape character, e.g. flooding and the characteristics of the towns and villages of South Worcestershire.

1.9 In due course, other separate planning documents will be produced to sit alongside the Joint Core Strategy, to implement the Core Strategy policies. Together these will then comprise the separate Local Development Frameworks for each local authority.

2. PREPARATORY WORK

2.1 Initial thinking on producing the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy was prompted in late 2006, with the recognition that the emerging housing strategy being put forward through the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (Phase 2 Review) could potentially impact on the three local authorities Core Strategies. Recognising the implications of this level of growth the decision to work together was sought from Councillors of each authority in December 2006.

2.2 The challenge for the three partner authorities was to work within the new planning system as well as developing effective working relationships between officers and councillors from each authority. Work commenced on preparing the Joint Core Strategy in January 2007.

2.3 The structure for joint working is set out right (Fig. 2) and has involved guidance from Councillors from the three authorities and input from officers at all levels. The Joint Advisory Panel, comprising 3 councillors from each authority has represented the interest of each local authority. This group is formally constituted and provides direction to the officer group, signing off on documents as well as feedback to the Council members.

2.4 The officer group is guided by Heads of Service, and Policy Managers from the respective Councils but has also brought in a range of admin and ancillary support from staff, other than planning officers. Representatives from Worcestershire County Council and Government Office for the West Midlands have also formally inputted into the process. A specific team, the Consultation Officer Team, has led on the consultation element of the Joint Core Strategy. This has drawn on officers and resources from the three local authorities, as well as external consultants as appropriate. Throughout the process invaluable support has been provided by the Community Planner based with West Midlands Planning Aid Service giving independent and expert advice on the consultation process.

2.5 Prior to the publication of the Issues and Options Paper in November 2007 the task of identifying a clear process for the formulating the documents required at key stages in the process was put in place. This involved preparing and seeking approval from the Joint Advisory Panel of a Consultation and Communications Strategy. This is available to view the website.

2.6 The strategy clearly set out the aims and objectives supporting the preparation of the Joint Core Strategy, setting out the programme of
consultation and engagement in each stage of the process (Fig. 1). Crucial to this was the alignment of each of the three local authorities ‘Statement of Community Involvement’, as well as guidance set out in PPS12 ‘Local Development Frameworks’ to ensure each stage meets the ‘test of soundness’. In addition, the process is also being benchmarked against the Planning Advisory Service’s ‘LDF soundness self-assessment toolkit’.

2.7 Effective and meaningful community participation and engagement is an essential element of the preparation of planning documents under the revised system and the principles that underpin the approach to the Issues and Options and Preferred Option stages are:

- Clear Communication;
- Making It easy to get involved;
- Learning and being Creative;
- Ensuring Involvement is Meaningful and Effective; finally
- Considering ideas and comments fairly.

2.8 Central to a coherent system of dialogue and engagement is an up to date database. The three local planning authority existing databases were reviewed, updated and amended. The composite Joint Core Strategy database included over 2,000 details of individuals, organisations, interest groups and statutory consultees with an interest in the process. Throughout, additional names were added following events or request for further information.

2.9 Each of the partner local authorities subscribed to a licence to use the consultation package provided by Limehouse Software. This allows for on-line consultation on documents, completion of questionnaire as well as database management.
3. INITIAL CONSULTATION, VISIONING AND EVENTS

Raising Awareness

3.1 A key challenge, apart from ensuring effective consultation and participation in the process, was from the outset to raise awareness of the joint working, the extent of the plan coverage and introducing the new planning framework. In addition, the ongoing consultation on the Regional Spatial Strategy coincided with the launch of the Joint Core Strategy and has led to significant levels of public and media interest. The awareness raising for the Joint Core Strategy has been well placed to build on this.

3.2 Given the scale of the project, geographical area, and partnership approach it was agreed early on in the process to create a ‘corporate identity’. This included a ‘logo’ (along side each local authorities logo), headed paper/compliments slips, and a consistent approach to all material published. A protocol for handling press and media enquiries was adopted and the identification of a single Head of Planning Service as lead officer on the project from Wychavon District Council.

3.3 A website was developed to provide a single point of contact for the Joint Core Strategy, providing information on key issues, feedback from consultation events, technical reports and background papers etc. The site went ‘live’ in April 2007 and was updated and redesigned in April 2008.

Events and Engagement

3.4 The first of a series of ongoing meetings with infrastructure and service providers was held in Worcester on 26 April 2007. These have been held on a quarterly basis to date and have brought together the three local authorities and a range of organisations, e.g. Worcestershire County Council, Highways Agency, Primary Care Trust, police, utility providers, and regional bodies such as Advantage.
West Midlands. These meetings have enabled a constructive dialogue and allowed the main infrastructure providers to feed comments into the preparation at Issues and Options as well as Preferred Options stages.

3.5 Early in the process a leaflet and poster campaign, launched to coincide with the initial press release, sought to raise awareness of the Joint Core Strategy. The leaflet was sent to all the contacts on the updated database, to Community Contact Centres and public libraries (accompanied by posters), as well as copy prepared for parish/town magazines and each of the three local authorities residents magazines. The latter are distributed to all households across the South Worcestershire area.

3.6 The first formal event was a ‘Vision Day’ held at Worcester Rugby Club on 14 May 2007. Representatives from key stakeholders across the region were invited to help develop the ‘vision’ and objectives for the Joint Core Strategy and begin to consider the range of main issues to feed into the preparation of the Issues and Options Paper. The audience comprised of statutory bodies, elected Councillors, representatives of Parish and Town Councils, amenity, business and hard to reach groups. The event was introduced by a brief film (produced by media students at University of Worcester) and the format centred on a number of workshop sessions. Community planning consultants, Quest Associates, helped structure and facilitate the day. The report of proceedings, film, agenda and attendance details are available to view on the Joint Core Strategy website.

3.7 In May 2007 Worcestershire County Council’s Citizen Panel was surveyed on the draft vision and objectives developed from the Visioning Day. The survey also asked for respondents to put themselves forward as ‘critical friend’ for the Joint Core Strategy. This generated a pool of 250 people, effectively a ‘Citizen Panel’ for the Joint Core Strategy work. This group was surveyed again at the Issues and Options stage.

3.8 In June 2007 an exhibition publicising the Joint Core Strategy was placed in the Community Contact Centres, and selected public libraries in
the main towns across the South Worcestershire area. The exhibition was also placed, on two separate days, in supermarket entrances in Droitwich Spa and Pershore. A series of parish and town council briefing events were also held throughout June at which officers ran a ‘question & answer’ session for councillors and fed back on the ‘Vision Day’ outcomes.

3.9 An informal questionnaire was prepared to support the above events and assist in developing the Issues and Options. This sought views from the community on potential housing development options. In raising the profile of the Joint Core Strategy officers attended a number of community events over the early summer of 2007, including the King George V Playing Field Open Day, the Ronkswood Ball Games Opening in Worcester and the Eastern Food and Music Festival in Evesham.

3.10 Following the 2007 May Local Elections, in which all three local authorities had seats contested, the first of a series of joint briefing meetings were held for the elected Councillors from each of the three local authorities. The purpose of the event was to set out the next key stages of the process, brief recently elected Councillors, and allow further discussion on ‘vision’, objectives and issues that emerged from the ‘Visioning Day’.

3.11 In July 2007 a Sustainability Appraisal workshop was held with key stakeholders at the Countryside Centre within Worcester Woods Country Park on the outskirts of Worcester. This event was facilitated by consultants Enfusion and provided an opportunity for those present to consider and explore the Sustainability Appraisal framework and its application in assessing the content of the Issues and Options Paper. Information on this event is available to view on the website.

3.12 Given the parallel preparation of the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Phase II Review and interest generated in the local press and media during the first part of 2007 it was felt necessary to provide information direct to the local press and media early on in the process. Therefore, the first of a series of meetings was held on 16 July 2007 to present the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy, differentiate it from the Regional Spatial Strategy, and set out what had been undertaken in terms of consultation and awareness raising. Press releases and cuttings are available to view on the website.

4. ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION/FEEDBACK

Purpose, Scope and methodology

4.1 The Issues and Options Paper was prepared over the summer of 2007, and developed with the information generated through the initial consultation and technical evidence. The approach was to ensure the Issues and Options Paper was accessible and clear to understand. A shorter explanatory leaflet and longer and shorter versions of the response questionnaire supported the main document. The longer questionnaire was piloted with a number of local authority staff and as a result significantly amended to provide a document freer from ‘jargon’ and written in plain English. A business edition of the questionnaire was also produced and circulated to this group via each of the local authorities Economic Development Teams.

4.2 The formal consultation commenced on 2 November 2007 and ran for six weeks up to 14 December 2007 although submissions were accepted by 21 December to allow for posting etc. prior to the Christmas period. This was launched at a Press and Media Conference held on 29 October 2007 in The Guildhall, Worcester. The Issues and Options Paper, along with the supporting longer questionnaire and a covering letter were sent to all statutory consultees on the database to coincide with the start of the consultation period. In addition, copies of the leaflet and shorter questionnaire were sent to other interested parties and stakeholders on the database, i.e. agents, developers, community groups and individuals. A further 260 questionnaire were sent to Worcestershire County Council’s Citizen Panel who had offered to act as ‘critical friends’ to the process. Copies of the shorter questionnaire were provided to the Worcester Mosque for distribution and a survey was also prepared and circulated to local businesses.
4.3 As part of the initial mail out, Parish and Town Councils (who are statutory consultees) were provided with an information pack that included additional questionnaires, posters for distribution to shops/notice boards, and press release for the parish magazines. Documents were also placed in all the public libraries across South Worcestershire and in the Community Contact Centres.

Events, locations and dates

4.4 Central to the consultation process were a series of public meetings, 20 in total held in rural ‘clusters’ across the South Worcestershire area. The format consisted of an early afternoon meeting for local parish and town councillors for Malvern Hills and Wychavon Districts and common to Worcester City an open ‘community event’ during the early evening. Officers from each of the three authorities staffed the events, with local district councillors in attendance. In addition valuable support was provided by West Midlands Planning Aid Community Planning worker throughout the process. In total 556 individuals attended these meetings.

4.5 In addition a number of other ‘events’ and direct consultation with key stakeholders were held to raise awareness and reach out to specific groups. These included:

Local Strategic Partnership Meetings
- as appropriate pre-consultation
Race Equality Council AGM - 30/10/07
Youth Democracy Day (Wychavon) - 31/10/07
Droitwich Spa Farmers Market - 3/11/07
South Worcestershire Civic Societies, The Guildhall - 9/11/07
Community Fair, Worcester - 10/11/07
Teme Valley Farmers Market - 11/11/07
Worcestershire Assembly - 22/11/07
Federation of Small Businesses - 6/12/07
Technical Meeting - 28/11/07
Worcester Sixth Form College - 10/12/07

Images: above right: The AdTrike outside The Guildhall, Worcester playing an audio version of the poem; Above middle: Teme Valley Farmers Market; Right: Issue 01 of the swjcs newsletter.
Promotion and advertising

4.6 In the run-up and throughout awareness of the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy and Issues and Options Paper was achieved through:

- an extensive advertising campaign in the local press, and media including Radio Wyvern and BBC Hereford & Worcester;
- Promotional film prepared by media students at University Worcester;
- Use of ‘adbike’ at several external events, i.e. farmers markets.
- 4 page article in each of the authorities residents magazine, as well as articles in Worcestershire Life and ‘copy’ for church and parish/town council magazines;
- updated information on the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy website;
- Copies of explanatory leaflet/short questionnaire sent to Worcester Mosque;
- Travelling exhibition at all main libraries, Community Contact Centre and County Hall; and
- E-mail of leaflet/short questionnaire to all staff within the 3 authorities and at the County Council.

All of the above work represented a significant amount of officer time and co-ordination between the three local authorities and, in the context of policy consultation work, has led to a positive response rate. Details of the venues and dates of events, along with other information specific to this aspect of the consultation can be found on the website.

Response and Headline Feedback

4.7 The outcome was a total of 755 long questionnaires and 1,400 short questionnaires received. The total of 2,155 responses. In addition a total of 2,500 ‘hits’ were received on the website between 1 November and 31 December 2007. Of those visits, conversions to the online consultation portal and completion of online questionnaire were 116. Table 2 provides a breakdown of the overall profile of those who responded. 80 agents, representing development interests and promoting specific sites also made detailed submissions.

4.8 Responses were received from a broad range of geographic areas within South Worcestershire (Fig. 3) and Worcester city (Fig 3a). A summary of the findings, initial analysis and response are set out in Appendix 1.

The level of feedback on the different sections was varied. Not surprisingly a number of options received a great deal of attention, whereas others were more limited. However, there was a strong level of support for key areas that have given direction to preparing the Preferred Options paper. Under the headings in the Issues and Options Paper these included:

- Approval of the ‘vision’ and objectives, with minor amendments suggested.

Stronger Communities

- Development to strengthen roles of main settlements. Sequential approach – ‘brownfield’ then periphery.
- Retain the Green Belt.
- Focus employment at main settlements/ small scale employment in larger villages.
- No development without essential infra structure.

Meeting the Needs of All Generations

- All new housing should make a contribution to affordable housing.

Economic Success Shared by All

- Work with important employers/industries to ensure long term retention of Jobs.

Better Environment

- Historic character/landscape issues.
- Protect, conserve and enhance local landscape character.
- Stricter controls on flooding.
- New key infrastructure outside flood zones.

Improving Health and Wellbeing/Safer Communities

- Essential services to be delivered alongside growth areas.
- Protect public open space, sport and recreation facilities.
### Profile of Responses

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Received</th>
<th>Received On-line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>As of 21/01/08</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long questionnaire</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short questionnaire</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Long Questionnaire: About You

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender - All</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - All</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Origin - All</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status - All</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-9 yrs</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-14 yrs</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Short Questionnaire: About You

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender - All</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age - All</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-9 yrs</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-14 yrs</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Origin - All</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status - All</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-9 yrs</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-14 yrs</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Both questionnaires combined: About You

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Total)</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Total)</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-9 yrs</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-14 yrs</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Origin (Total)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (Total)</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-9 yrs</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10-14 yrs</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. TOWARDS PREFERRED OPTIONS

Next Steps

5.1 In terms of consultation it is important to keep up momentum, building on the high profile and levels of awareness achieved from the Issues and Options consultation stage. Therefore feedback will be provided via the first edition of a newsletter, as well as information in the spring/summer copies of the residents magazines. In addition a series of key events have taken place:

- Briefing for Elected Members - 28 January 2008
- ‘Reality Event’ for Stakeholders - 3 March 2008
- Town and Parish Council Briefings - March/April 2008
- Seminar for Home Builders Federation and Developers - 8 April 2008
- Meeting with English Heritage and County Archaeology Service - 9 April 2008
- Breakfast Briefing for Local Businesses - 1 May 2008
- Seminar with CABE (Council for Architecture and Built Environment), ATLAS (Advisory Team for Large Applications), Natural England - 7 May 2008.

5.2 Work is ongoing refining the consultation strategy for the Preferred Options consultation scheduled for September 2008. This includes:

- Joint Members Briefing - 11 June 2008
- Press Briefing - 13 June 2008
- Press launch for Preferred Options - 15 September 2008
- Press advertising campaign in run-up to Preferred Option launch and during six-week consultation (this is in addition to
the Statutory Notice in the press)
• Preferred Option consultation promoted in the autumn editions (early October) of the residents magazine
• Co-ordinated schedule of events and workshops throughout September and October 2008.

It is evident from the respondents profile at the Issues and Options stage that it is important at Preferred Options to more effectively engage with younger age groups, as well as those in minority/ethnic communities. This is acknowledged, and with this in mind a school ‘sustainable education’ resource pack is being developed for use in schools and a number specific stakeholder events are planned for the Black and Ethnic Minority communities within the area.

Conclusions

5.3 The consultation up to the end of the Issues and Options stage sought to achieve a number of objectives. These were to ensure effective engagement and achieve a good response to inform the Preferred Options, raise awareness and comprehension of the new planning system, and within that the role of the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy.

5.4 This report has set out how this was achieved through both integration of each of the three partner authorities Statements of Community Involvement, and the agreement on a consultation and communications strategy. These sought to deliver a range of established and innovative consultation techniques that have achieved a good basis, as set out in the following section, to inform the preparation of the Preferred Options. The challenge is to now maintain the momentum and ensure a successful level of community engagement following the publication of the Preferred Options paper in September 2008.
Appendix 1

SOUTH WORCESTERSHIRE JOINT CORE STRATEGY
Report on the comments made through the Issues and Options Consultation.

1. Purpose of the report

1.1 To provide interested parties with an overview of responses and the directions that the evidence is leading on an issue by issue basis.

2. Background

2.1 The Issues and Options Paper was published for a six week period of consultation on 4 November 2007. This resulted in a total of 755 long questionnaires, 1,400 short questionnaires and 80 individual letters from agents and development interests.

3. Format of report

3.1 The report relate to the Vision, objectives and individual analysis of each Issue (1 to 32) although there are overlaps as the ‘spatial element’ begins to come into play. However, they all follow the same format:

- Summary of the questionnaire responses.
- Summary of the comments on the questionnaires and the letters.
- Summary of responses from Worcestershire County Council, Government Office and the West Midlands Regional Assembly.
- Summary of responses from other key technical/other statutory organisations.
- Outstanding issues which officers consider need to be addressed.
- Where the evidence is taking us which gives officers initial thoughts on a direction for the Preferred Options.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue: Do you agree with the Vision?</th>
<th>Section Two: Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 20.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 62.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree 5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelming support for the vision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Locally distinctive character of South Worcestershire is its rural nature/communities. This needs greater emphasis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More specific, too vague and could apply to anywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Importance of Worcester and relationship with the principle towns, and the rural setting needs to be emphasised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Vision is unclear over role of the Central Technology Belt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Responses from key consultees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worcestershire County Council:</strong> Various wording changes in relation to transport, environment. Historic environment weak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOWM:</strong> Local distinctiveness could be developed further. Need to include roles of the towns and their relationship to Worcester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WMRA:</strong> Generally aligns with the Regional Spatial Strategy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment Agency:</strong> Sustainable management of water should be mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hereford and Worcestershire Chamber of Commerce:</strong> Supports the Vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Heritage:</strong> Greater prominence to the main towns; expand on diversity and richness e.g. distinctive character, historic assets and cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worcestershire Wildlife Trust:</strong> Put forward revised wording to vision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outstanding issues:** Incorporating the towns and their relationship to Worcester. Improving local distinctiveness. Specific reference should be made to the requirement for water management.

**Where the evidence is taking us:** Minor rewording.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue: Are the objectives appropriate to deliver the proposed vision and provide a basis for the joint core strategy?</th>
<th>Section Three: The Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 14.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 62.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree 4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strong support for the objectives.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

- **Stronger Communities:**
  - Settlement hierarchy inappropriate.
  - Improve accessibility.
  - Enhance/protect rural communities / farming/horticulture.

- **Meeting the needs of all generations:**
  - Ensure communities have access to all facilities.
  - Developers need to contribute.
  - Places of worship have been forgotten.
  - Objective to improve local affordable housing.

- **Economic Success that is shared by all:**
  - Needs to support existing farming economy not just new businesses.
  - Education needs to be emphasised.
  - Infrastructure needed to deliver the vision.
  - Maximise brownfield sites.

- **Better Environment:**
  - The historic environments not fully addressed.
  - Climate change issues should be more explicit.
  - Protect the Green Belt.
  - Emphasise use of previously developed land.

- **Improving Health and Wellbeing:**
  - Keep the green areas within urban areas.

- **Communities that are safe and feel safe:**
  - Education should be stronger.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:** Various wording changes.

**GOWM:** None.

**WMRA:** Generally align with the Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 2 Revision.

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**Environment Agency:** Water resources need to be incorporated.

**English Heritage:** ‘Better Environment’ objectives should include the historic environment. Reference to mitigation and adaptation to climate change impacts required.

**Worcestershire Wildlife Trust:** Suggest changes to ‘Better Environment’ objectives, but also consider there should be greater emphasis on climate change issues.

**Outstanding issues:** None.

**Where the evidence is taking us:** Minor rewording to reflect comments particularly in regard to education, climate change and the historic environment.

**Issue 1: Is the proposed hierarchy of city/towns/villages a good basis for development strategy?**

**Summary of Questionnaire responses:**

Option 1 Allocate in accordance with settlement hierarchy:

- Strongly Agree 20.8%  Agree 62.2%  Disagree 12%  Strongly Disagree 5%

Option 2 Use development to strengthen the roles of Droitwich Spa, Evesham and
Malvern:
Strongly Agree 20.4%  Agree 59.4%  Disagree 10%  Strongly Disagree 5.3%
Option 3 Use development to strengthen the role of villages:
Strongly Agree 15.3%  Agree 43.6%  Disagree 29.2%  Strongly Disagree 11%

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:

Top three comments:
- Significant support for a new town (to south east and north west of the River Severn, Throckmorton, Deford Airfield, adjacent to Worcestershire Parkway suggested) as long as infrastructure is provided.
- Hierarchy generally supported - particularly to direct development towards Worcester, main towns with support for some development in Category 1 villages.
- Development should be focused on brownfield and greenfield sites.

Other comments:
- Infrastructure needs to be considered and improved e.g. public transport, services, hospitals etc.
- Promote tourism / education / economy in Worcester and other towns.
- Link housing to employment.
- Development should be divided between all settlements / stagger or zone development.
- No building on Green Belt or flood plains.
- Restrict development in villages and direct development to improve services that already exist.
- Question whether village facilities are enough to meet current needs of community and that the hierarchy is subjective.
- Affordable housing for key workers/young people/families – look at housing needs study.
- Some support for grouping settlements together.
- Strategic function of larger settlements needs recognition.
- Suggestions Category 3 villages should not be included in hierarchy.

Summary of Responses from key consultees

Worcestershire County Council:
- General agreement with settlement hierarchy.
- Considerable investment is needed for transport infrastructure and public transport throughout the settlement hierarchy.

GOWM:
- There is a need to include the roles of other towns e.g. Malvern and Evesham and their relationship to each other and Worcester.
- Consideration needs to be given to the impact of growth options on other settlements.

WMRA:
- Settlement hierarchy generally in conformity – although RSS Phase 2 would allow some flexibility concerning small scale housing growth in small rural villages. These may not be in the Category 1 to 3 villages so flexibility is required.
- Option 1 and 3 in conformity with RSS, although Option 3 needs to refer to Policy
RR1 and RR4.

- Option 1 could be against part of the emerging RSS Policy SR2.
- Option 5 ‘eco town’ is not in accordance with DCLG ‘Eco Towns Prospectus’.

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**Highway Agency:** Satisfied settlement hierarchy is based on evidence relating to public transport. Improving levels of public transport in all settlements is essential to delivering sustainable growth. Any growth in Category 2 and 3 villages must be accompanied by a comprehensive package of public transport improvements.

**Campaign to Protect Rural England:** Expansion of towns and villages should be considered on an individual basis, not on settlement hierarchy criteria. Limited brownfield land. Garden grabbing affects the character. Consider redevelopment of redundant buildings.

**Outstanding issues:**
Need to update the Village Facilities and Accessibility Study as numerous queries on methodology and resulting category that certain villages have been assigned.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
Most respondents favour development associated with the existing towns in South Worcestershire. Settlement hierarchy acceptable in principle. Flexible approach to allow some development in smaller settlements.

**Issue 2: Where should greenfield land be identified to meet development needs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4: Stronger Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Use greenfield land within built-up areas before greenfield land on periphery: Strongly Agree 21.4% Agree 27.7% Disagree 30% Strongly Disagree 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Identify land on the edge of Worcester: Strongly Agree 16.8% Agree 49.2% Disagree 20.7% Strongly Disagree 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 Identify land on the edge of main towns: Strongly Agree 14% Agree 58.2% Disagree 18.4% Strongly Disagree 9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 Identify land on the edge of Category 1 and 2 villages: Strongly Agree 8.9% Agree 36.4% Disagree 36.2% Strongly Disagree 18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 Growth should be concentrated in a new settlement: Strongly Agree 21.7% Agree 26.1% Disagree 25.8% Strongly Disagree 26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

- Urban extensions to take account of links to existing/proposed employment opportunities and services.
- Greenfield development should be in or around the main settlements.
- Build away from rivers, along existing transport corridors.
- More concentrated flats.
- Generally greenfield land within settlements should be protected.
- Greater density.
- There is enough brownfield.
- Agree Category 1 and 2 villages but also land on edge of Category 3 villages (e.g. Sale Green) to meet local needs.
- Not in villages.
- Several smaller ‘eco towns’.
- What is the true brownfield potential (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Employment Land Review).
- Convert employment land to housing.
- Eco town as long as it counts towards RSS figures.
- Preference to places near rail network.
- Respondents felt confused over the Joint Core Strategy ‘eco town’ and the Governments national ‘Eco-town’ initiative.
- Support greenfield, no to ‘eco town’ or use of greenfield in urban areas
- There were numerous suggestions of sites that may be suitable. These have been checked against the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment database.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:**
- In education terms ‘eco town’ of 10,000 would be most appropriate range for new schools.
- Option 1 not supported by County Highways.

**GOWM:** None.

**WMRA:**
- Option 1 (using greenfield land within built up areas would be against RSS emerging Policy SR2 (e)).
- Option 5 Eco town - against existing and RSS Phase 2 Policy (although if national policy is given precedent RSS may require minor review).

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**Highway Agency:** Concern regarding the capacity of the junctions on the M5. A46 around Evesham is also above capacity at present. Would support the allocation of sites that are located so as to reduce the need for travel through providing key linkages with existing and proposed employment sites and services, and high quality public transport for longer journeys.

**Campaign to Protect Rural England:** Do not agree that open space land in towns and city should be built on. Villages around Worcester unsuitable as growth satellites. Expansion of towns and villages preferable to new town.

**Environment Agency:** Development should be steered to areas with ‘low probability’ of flooding.

**Outstanding issues:**
In light of short listing of ‘Middle Quinton’ site for ‘Eco-Town’ location consideration required on how we move forward on the new settlement option - see below and under Issue 4.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
Suggests in general the need to protect greenfield land within city/Principle Urban Areas.
Support for development on edges of Worcester, Droitwich Spa, Evesham, Malvern, Pershore, Tenbury Wells, Upton-on-Severn.

### Issue 3: Should the Green Belt be reviewed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4: Stronger Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Option 1 Retain existing boundaries:  
Strongly Agree 45.8%  Agree 28.1%  Disagree 21.9%  Strongly Disagree 4.2%  
Option 2 Remove land around Worcester:  
Strongly Agree 3.6%  Agree 19.7%  Disagree 33.6%  Strongly Disagree 43.1%  
Option 3 Remove land around Droitwich Spa:  
Strongly Agree 5.7%  Agree 25.3%  Disagree 36.5%  Strongly Disagree 32.5%  
Option 4 Extend around Worcester:  
Strongly Agree 21.5%  Agree 29.8%  Disagree 38%  Strongly Disagree 10.6%  
Option 5 Extend around Droitwich Spa:  
Strongly Agree 14.4%  Agree 28.2%  Disagree 45.8%  Strongly Disagree 11.7%  

Strong support for the retention of existing boundaries.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**
- Green Belt boundaries should only be amended in exceptional circumstances.
- It is premature for the Joint Core Strategy to promote alterations to the Green Belt in the absence of a clear and justifiable basis enshrined in approved Regional Strategy.
- Should be sufficient strategic choice for distribution of development without the need for the review of the Green Belt.
- Green Belts are no longer sacrosanct but need to be reassessed and actively managed to create the sustainable communities desired.
- Other comments range from no change, through to suggesting areas for deletion as well as extension.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:**
- County Highways consider Green Belt should be reviewed, but must take account of accessibility issues.
- Ecologists consider Green Belt should be reviewed - may be preferable from ecology angle to build here than elsewhere.

**GOWM:** None received.  
**WMRA:** *Extending* the Green Belt not in conformity with RSS, although can make minor amends to draw it back in exceptional circumstances.

**Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**English Heritage:** Any review should consider the role of Green Belt in protecting the setting of the historic city of Worcester.  
**Highway Agency:** Capacity issues on Junctions 5 and 6 on the M5.  
**Natural England:** The Green Belt continues to be relevant and should be part of the ‘toolkit’ to manage high levels of growth including possible extensions.

**Outstanding issues:**
The need to undertake review the Green Belt.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
Probably only acceptable to make minor changes to the Green Belt boundary. Consider other approaches e.g. promote strategic gap/ green buffer/ wedge, linking to urban green space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 4: How should we cater for Worcester’s housing growth?</th>
<th>Section 4: Stronger Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Summary of Questionnaire responses:
Option 1 East of the city boundary:
Strongly Agree 19.7% Agree 43.8% Disagree 20.9% Strongly Disagree 15.6%
Option 2 West of the city boundary:
Strongly Agree 7.8% Agree 39.6% Disagree 39.8% Strongly Disagree 40%
Option 3 North of city boundary in the Green Belt:
Strongly Agree 5.75 Agree 43.5% Disagree 31.4% Strongly Disagree 19.4%
Option 4 North of the city outside the Green Belt:
Strongly Agree 5.7% Agree 43.5% Disagree 31.4% Strongly Disagree 19.4%
Option 5 South of the city boundary:
Strongly Agree 7.8% Agree 40.7% Disagree 36.2% Strongly Disagree 15.3%
Option 6 Create a free standing new settlement to meet Worcester’s needs:
Strongly Agree 21.3% Agree 28% Disagree 19.9% Strongly Disagree 30.8%

The Short Questionnaire indicated the highest support for spreading development around city. Equal support for development east or west of city. Growth to north and south least supported.

New settlement – no consensus where this could be. Many in favour of an ‘eco town’, but there were more against this option than for. Most popular locations were Throckmorton (62), Norton (49), Defford Airfield (29) and a variety of some 45 other locations, none mentioned more than 6 times, most only once or twice. Possibility of confusion with central Government’s Eco-Town initiative.

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:
• Opportunities within Worcester city boundary for housing development should be maximised.
• Housing growth should be located in areas not subject to environmental protection policies and close to transport networks.
• Development close to the M5 will encourage long distance commuting.
• Any consideration of a new settlement should only be on the basis that the additional homes would count towards the South Worcestershire target.
• The growth should be accommodated within sustainable settlements located within Malvern Hills and Wychavon.
• Development east of the city would seem logical as avoids many of the constraints.

Summary of Responses from key consultees:
Worcestershire County Council:
Use Integrated Transport model to find most sustainable locations for Worcester growth.
Ecology - all options could be non PPS9 (Biodiversity) compliant - depends on site specific data re biodiversity. This would have major implications for defining broad locations before detailed evidence available required on site basis.

GOWM: None received.

WMRA:
Eco town option not in conformity - and housing would be additional to target.
Green Belt option has to be in context of RSS (minor amends only).

Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue)
raised, if any):

**Highways Agency:** Looked at 8 possible broad locations on periphery of Worcester. Those that give rise to LESS CONCERN are:
- Land to west of city (Rushwick, where A4103 meet by-pass)
- Within the city boundary those that give rise to MOST CONCERN are:
  - East of the city, to the eastern side of M5.
  - South west of city in Middle Battenhall area and Whittington west of M5.
  - Land to south east of city (Norton area).

In summary, sites on east are likely to have most impact on motorway junctions.

**Environment Agency:** Suggested policy option is put forward to bring forward sites at low flood risk, where infrastructure provision is available or could be provided.

**Outstanding issues:**
- How to assess the issue of the Eco-Town option.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
- No definite direction although sites to the east of Worcester could be less sustainable and have greater impact on the Motorway junctions. The Issues and Options consultation suggested that an ‘eco-town’ proposal within the Joint Core Strategy had limited support. However, since then the announcement by DCLG to short-list the Middle Quinton site means the Preferred Options must address its potential implementation should the site make the last 10 in autumn 2008.

**Issue 5: Which broad areas should be targeted for housing growth in the districts of Malvern Hills and Wychavon?**

**Summary of Questionnaire responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Focus growth in Droitwich Spa, Evesham and Malvern:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Distribute growth amongst the main towns of the area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Majority of growth to Droitwich Spa, Evesham and Malvern, balance distributed to other towns and Category 1 and 2 villages:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>As Option 3 but include Category 3 villages:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Direct growth to the Rural Regeneration Zone (RRZ):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 2 received strongest support based on Long Questionnaire findings. Option 3 received some support. The responses from the Short Questionnaire support this pattern.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Comments on questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eco town mentioned as a solution 11 times, but specific location only mentioned twice (Throckmorton) under this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some general agreement of a targeted focus on the main towns but not equally distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caution regarding growth at Tenbury Wells and Upton-on-Severn because of flood issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caution regarding flood issues generally re development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several comments that some Category 3 villages could take growth, especially to meet local needs/ sustain services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some favoured limited growth in Rural Regeneration Zone, but others against</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
any growth here because of need for infrastructure.

- Several comments favoured growth on /near rail stations/proposed stations, and on bus routes.
- Several comments that development should be spread evenly everywhere rather than in larger concentrations.

**Comments from letters**

- Very little consensus – perhaps as at least 18 of the 28 letters were from consultants /agents, most representing clients with landholdings that would favour different options.
- Option 3 main settlements and Category 1 and 2 villages slightly more supported.
- Of those who mentioned this Option, most in support of settlement hierarchy in principle.
- No one location supported over another, although Droitwich Spa, Evesham, Worcester fringe in Wychavon and Tewkesbury area specifically mentioned.
- Need for some growth in Category 3 villages.
- Growth in Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (Response from AONB Management Board).

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:**
County Highways consider Option 5 as inappropriate regarding accessibility (directing growth to Rural Regeneration Zone), unless for proportionate local needs within the locality.

**GOWM:** No comment.

**WMRA:**
Category 3 villages for balance of growth not supported.
Directing growth to Rural Regeneration Zone not in conformity with emerging RSS.

**Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**Highways Agency:** Looked at possible growth scenarios. Little clear steer as based on existing public transport assessment and underlying predicted growth on Strategic Road Network. Some general areas of significant concern, particularly east of Worcester with potential impacts on M5 Junctions 6 and 7. Also at Evesham regarding impact on A46(T). But no areas specifically excluded, means that those of high / medium concern require more infrastructure for Strategic Road Network, could still be concerns on local roads for all sites, and this work not yet done.

**Environment Agency:** A policy option is put forward to bring forward sites at low flood risk, where infrastructure provision is available or could be provided.

**Outstanding issues:**
Areas outside these categories, such as land adjacent to Tewkesbury and Stourport - on-Severn need to be addressed. Need to establish position with GOWM concerning cross-boundary working at county and regional levels.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
Generally need to direct growth to towns and Category 1 villages. Development in Category 2 and 3 villages to meet local needs. Growth in Category 3 villages (and below) and Rural Regeneration Zone not supported in general, although a case can be made for specific settlements therefore there is a need to be flexible.
generally located in order to contribute to sustainable development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</th>
<th>Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Principally at Worcester with remainder at Droitwich Spa, Evesham and Malvern:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 14.2% Agree 37.4% Disagree 42.2% Strongly Disagree 6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Principally at Worcester with remainder distributed amongst all main towns:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 10.8% Agree 53.8% Disagree 28.8% Strongly Disagree 6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 Principally at Worcester with remainder distributed in association with the location of new development:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 14.9% Agree 46.7% Disagree 32% Strongly Disagree 6.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 Principally at Worcestershire Parkway (near Norton):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 14.1% Agree 42.4% Disagree 31.6% Strongly Disagree 11.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 Principally within the Central Technology Belt (CTB):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 11/3% Agree 48.9% Disagree 31.9% Strongly Disagree 8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6 In locations adjacent to junctions along the M5:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 15.4% Agree 47% Disagree 25.4% Strongly Disagree 12.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 3 received strongest support, followed by Option 2. Option 1 also received a degree of favour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top three comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Significant support for development to be close to home, work from home (inc. live-work) and close to public transport and housing and employment should go hand in hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Development should be near the principle towns or Worcester city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New town or urban extension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Little additional employment needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employment should not be located near Motorway junctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employment needs to be away from towns, support rural businesses,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use of brownfield sites first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Good provision of public transport and cycling lanes need to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Locate near towns and main roads, support for either side of M50.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Promote mixed development, working from home and live-work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CTB needs better definition, area too large and stretches too far east.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remove CTB from the Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In accordance with proposed hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Locate different employment uses to the appropriate area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not in Green Belt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Container freight interchange junction at Worcestershire Parkway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- More analysis of commuting patterns needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protection and provision of employment is in important.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Responses from key consultees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employment sites close to M5 will increase commuting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Worcester sustainable location for employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- New development should meet local need and should not be situated in a single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOWM:
- Sustainability Appraisal for each of the Options is commended.

WMRA:
- Options 4 and 6 (principally at Worcestershire Parkway, or close to M5) NOT in conformity with PA6 (1) Prosperity for All – would fail to produce a portfolio of land.

Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):

**Environment Agency:** A policy option is put forward to bring forward sites at low flood risk, where infrastructure provision is available or could be provided.

**English Heritage:** Employment should support development of balanced communities, local regeneration needs and promote sustainable development.

**Highway Agency:** Support new employment development that promotes the use of rail or water for the movement of freight.

Outstanding issues:
Need to resolve differences between ELR suggested growth and Option 2 Regional Spatial Strategy employment targets.

Where the evidence is taking us:
Generally employment should be directed at towns, and in association with new housing development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 7: How can the development needs of rural communities best be met?</th>
<th>Section 4: Stronger Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Only promote development in villages to meet affordable housing needs: Strongly Agree 15.1% Agree 31.2% Disagree 41.5% Strongly Disagree 12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Promote small scale employment development in Category 1 and 2 villages: Strongly Agree 14.4% Agree 62% Disagree 17% Strongly Disagree 6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 Focus employment in Rural Regeneration Zone (RRZ): Strongly Agree 8.8% Agree 46.5% Disagree 35.1% Strongly Disagree 9.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 Direct mixed use development to settlements with few facilities to improve their sustainability: Strongly Agree 15.7% Agree 58.2% Disagree 18% Strongly Disagree 8.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Long Questionnaire findings supported Option 2. Short Questionnaire overwhelmingly in favour of combined housing and employment to meet local needs.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

Top three comments:
- Support for mixed tenure, sustainable developments, encourage diversification and mixed use development.
- Villages should have opportunity to expand and encourage affordable housing.
- Locate development near to good services, public transport and improve existing services.
Other comments:
• Develop a variety of small rural businesses and types, variety of building design and range of housing tenure.
• Support Category 1 and 2 villages.
• Brownfield sites should be used first.
• Employment should follow housing.
• Support for agricultural businesses and encourage Rural Regeneration Zone.
• Development should link in with public transport.
• Minimal development, especially in villages.
• Employment should be located in towns.
• Employment close to homes.
• Promote home working.
• Infrastructure should link in with development.
• Locate majority of development at Badsey.
• Promote employment in Category 3 villages.
• Support for more energy efficient housing.
• Further development will increase road use.
• RR1 of RSS sufficient – no need for local policy.
• Failure to address how of residential needs of community can be met.

Summary of Responses from key consultees:

Worcestershire County Council:
• County Highways - needs sustainable access to Worcester and Market Towns.
• Option 4 - re mixed use sites only sustainable if close match between housing and employment types.
• School rolls falling in rural areas - even some development would not save some schools in unsustainable locations.
• County Ecologist - need mix of Options 1 and 2 (affordable housing/ employment in Category 1 and 2 villages) with Option 4.

GOWM: No comments.

WMRA:
• Option 1 only development in villages for affordable housing NOT in conformity with CF2c, i.e. can not just be for affordable housing.
• Option 4 NOT in conformity (directing growth to smaller communities to improve their sustainability) refers to para. 6.21 focus Market Towns and larger villages.

Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):

English Heritage: Option 1 and 4 should be combined and tailored to individual villages.

AONB Management Board:
Development should be small scale and located in existing settlements.

Outstanding issues: None identified.

Where the evidence is taking us:
Need to allow for some development in Category 1 and 2 villages. But scope in other villages to meet local need.
Falling school numbers suggests that issue of type of housing is important in some
villages, e.g. family housing and affordable.

**Issue 8: What can be done to reduce the need to travel by car in South Worcestershire?**

**Section 4: Stronger Communities**

**Summary of Questionnaire responses:**

Option 1 Locate new development in areas easily accessible by a range of transport as an alternative to the private car:
- Strongly Agree 43.2%
- Agree 49%
- Disagree 4.7%
- Strongly Disagree 3.1%

Option 2 Ensure new development provides access to an existing range of services:
- Strongly Agree 39.4%
- Agree 54.6%
- Disagree 3.6%
- Strongly Disagree 2.4%

Option 3 Protect existing shops and community buildings, especially in rural areas:
- Strongly Agree 39.9%
- Agree 48.1%
- Disagree 10.1%
- Strongly Disagree 1.9%

Option 4 Attract more jobs to South Worcestershire by providing more employment land to reduce out commuting:
- Strongly Agree 27.8%
- Agree 47.7%
- Disagree 18.9%
- Strongly Disagree 5.6%

Long Questionnaire Option 1 most favoured. Also strong support for Option 2, generally most options supported, in particular those mentioned in additional comments. Development in villages should favour local people e.g. affordable housing.

Short Questionnaire Option F overwhelmingly in support of Option 1 in Long Questionnaire.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

- Popular theme was the need to provide a much cheaper (through subsidies), more reliable and accessible public transport network that is fully integrated, e.g. bus and train timetables worked along side each other.

- Rail connections and Park and Ride schemes also popular. Many respondents wanting old rail lines opened especially those that would increase usability between Malvern and Worcester. Park and Ride comments focused on the Worcestershire Parkway/Norton area and many believe that placing a Park and Ride with a new rail station will offer an alternative to the current car commute into the Birmingham conurbation.

- Only a few direct comments were made in relation to Option 2 and 3 many comments focusing on the need to provide better public transport services and infrastructure. Where comments were made a majority of respondents agreed that development would be the only real answer to ensure services remain used (especially in rural settlements).

- The justification of growth levels set out by Regional Spatial Strategy was queried.

- A very frequent question was related to the feasibility of reducing commuting patterns by providing more employment land near to where people lived. Generally respondents felt that this was not achievable and would only further exacerbate current commuting trends.

- Of the remaining comments the following were the most reoccurring:
  - Prioritise cycling routes and create an integrated cycle network across Worcester city.
  - Improve frequency of bus and rail services (including scheduling more later trains).
  - Public transport prices should be affordable and fixed at a price that is a
realistic alternative to the car.

- Strengthen S106 Agreements.
- Improve connectivity between major settlements.
- Reintroduce/revaluate previously closed railway stations and lines.
- Many felt that car users are being persecuted. However the majority went on to say that future planning should design development that reduces the need to travel in urban areas.
- Encourage car sharing.
- Home working – improve IT infrastructure around South Worcestershire.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:**

- Requires investment in rapid transit systems along major routes/ in/out of Worcester and major towns.
- May need demand management in Worcester and main towns.

**GOWM:** No comments received.

**WMRA:** No comments received.

**Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**English Heritage:** Options 1 and 4 combined are preferred.

**Highway Agency:** The Preferred Option should include a mix of the four Options given. All new developments should be required to produce and implement a travel plan.

**Outstanding issues:** None identified.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**

Need policies that try and improve public transport as alternative to car, even in rural areas.

---

**Issue 9: What can be done to encourage more sustainable means of travel?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</th>
<th>Section 4: Stronger Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1  Provide new integrated public transport services:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Support 58.2% Agree 38.3% Disagree 2.8% Strongly Disagree 0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2  Develop a new main line railway station at Worcestershire Parkway and improve access to national rail services and encouragement of local trips:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 51% Agree 39.1% Disagree 7.4% Strongly Disagree 2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3  Increase traffic management and parking controls in centres of Worcester and main towns:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 24.9% Agree 33.7% Disagree 28.1% Strongly Disagree 13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 Introduce Road Congestion Charges:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 7.7% Agree 11.2% Disagree 30.9% Strongly Disagree 50.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 Secure car-free housing schemes in accessible locations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 12.5% Agree 30.6% Disagree 34.4% Strongly Disagree 22.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6 Promote community transport in rural areas:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 40.9% Agree 51.2% Disagree 6.1% Strongly Disagree 1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7 Increase use of canals and rivers for freight and passengers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 42.1% Agree 41.3% Disagree 12.7% Strongly Disagree 3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most support for Option 1 and Option 6. Option 2 was also well supported and there was significant support for Option 7. Options 4 and Option 5 were least supported.
**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

- Parkway should go to Ashchurch (Gloucestershire Parkway) to avoid urban sprawl at Norton and south of Worcester.
- Agree with the proposal to improve bus facilities and rail capacity.
- Multi modal interchanges will encourage more sustainable means of travel.
- Link all public transport to internet or smart signs so that public transport can be easily accessed.
- Reopen old railway stations.
- Encourage pedestrian river taxis and more freight to rail and waterways.
- New housing and employment development should be directed towards locations that are well served by existing local community facilities, infrastructure and services, including public transport.
- Safer travel routes for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.
- Apply DoT ‘Manual for Streets’ design criteria.
- Cheaper and more convenient public transport is required.
- Concentrating developments around Worcester will result in surrounding communities becoming unsustainable and is counter to the desire to reduce the necessity to travel.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:**
County Highways emphasised need to promote sustainable travel and need to publicise it. Promote cycling and walking, and networks from housing to services.

**GOWM:** No comments.

**WMRA:** No comments.

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**Highways Agency:** Support the mix of all the Options and a mechanism and programme for securing these should be established at an early stage. Travel Plans should be used to promote cycling and walking. Support securing improvements to the rail system.

**English Heritage:** A combination of Options is required with green infrastructure planning used to encourage walking and cycling.

**Outstanding issues:**
Implementation and delivery of Worcestershire Parkway.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
Need to promote more integrated public transport systems – including cycling and walking. Worcestershire Parkway received strong support from the respondents but issues remain from technical/delivery providers as to realistic delivery and implementation of proposal.

**Issue 10: What should be the priorities for improving transport infrastructure?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4: Stronger Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Questionnaire responses:**

**Worcester Specific Options:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Development should not proceed without the provision of essential transport infrastructure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Pursue the implementation of public transport improvements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>Dual the Worcester Southern Link Road:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>Complete the Worcester North-West By-pass:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**South Worcestershire wide Options:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 6</th>
<th>Safeguard land around rail stations for improved facilities and passenger transfer:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 52.2%</td>
<td>Agree 44.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 7</th>
<th>Improve capacity at Motorway junctions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 23.6%</td>
<td>Agree 44.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 8</th>
<th>Address movement / access issues arising from flooding:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 39.1%</td>
<td>Agree 53.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 9</th>
<th>Identify specific transport improvements for Droitwich Spa, Malvern and Evesham:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 28%</td>
<td>Agree 56.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long Questionnaire Option 1 received most support. This was also overwhelmingly supported (Option E) in the Short Questionnaire. Option 2 also supported and a generally high level of support for Options 3 and Option 4.

For South Worcestershire wide strong overall support for Option 6 to Option 9.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

Includes summary of 'open' Questionnaire comments: 4.10.10. Priorities for Transport Infrastructure:

- Improve rail/LRT/bus provision.
- Deliver integrated user friendly and reliable public transport.
- Upgrade parking facilities at railway stations.
- Upgrade all M5 junctions, i.e. Junction 5 to 8.
- Introduce residents parking schemes.
- Park-and-Ride around city and Principle Urban Areas.
- By-pass to south west of Evesham.
- Rail station Fernhill Heath/Rushwick.
- Link Malvern to M5/M50 to relieve congestion around Worcester.
- Improve A44/A49.
- Remove on-street parking to relieve congestion.
- Upgrade of road network would lead to future congestion, e.g. Junction 7 M5 and dual Southern Link Road.
- Upgrade road infrastructure around Droitwich Spa.
- Dial-a-Ride scheme for rural communities.
- Better bus services for rural communities.
- Developer contributions to improve public transport.
- Dual Malvern/Cotswolds rail line.
- Encourage cycling by improving network.
- Implement Worcestershire Parkway.
- Build bridge across River Severn to north of Worcester city.
- Reduce need to commute by providing jobs locally.
- Encourage Travel Plans and car sharing schemes.
- Eastern by-pass for Malvern.
- Introduce traffic calming and pedestrian friendly townscape.
- Deliver sustainable patterns of development to reduce reliance on private vehicles.
- Utilise waterways for freight transport.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**
**Worcestershire County Council:**

Strategy needs clear recognition that significant transport infrastructure is required to meet the growth.
Investment, in the first instance should be directed to sustainable transport modes, necessary infrastructure and services.
Long list of requirements including dualling Southern Link Road; North West By-Pass; increased passenger transport with at least six Park and Ride sites; Worcestershire Parkway; city centre traffic demand management; walking/cycling routes. BUT NEARLY ALL WORCESTER FOCUSED - NEED MORE FEEDBACK ON OTHER TOWNS, ESP. MALVERN, PERSHORE, EVESHAM, DROITWICH SPA.

GOWM: No comments.
WMRA: No comments.

**Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**Highways Agency:**
All development should, as far is possible, be located to reduce the need to travel. However improvements to strategic road network will be required to accommodate growth proposed by Regional Spatial Strategy Revision. A timetable for securing the preferred options needs to be clearly defined.

**Outstanding issues:**
Appraise LTP2 and Highway Agency strategy for future infrastructure upgrades.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
We need policies that will match infrastructure requirements to development, e.g. phasing of growth. Essential to involve other agencies, utilities and service providers throughout phasing process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 11: How do we ensure the provision of infrastructure in advance of development?</th>
<th>Section 4: Stronger Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong> Option 1 Development should not proceed until all types of essential infrastructure are provided: Strongly Agree 55% Agree 35.5% Disagree 8.5% Strongly Disagree 0.9% Option 2 Set out priorities for infrastructure provision required to serve new development: Strongly Agree 50.8% Agree 43.8% Disagree 4.3% Strongly Disagree 1.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 and Option 2 equally and overwhelmingly popular.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Questionnaire open comments or letters received:**

- Development should proceed based around a sustainable passenger transport network.
- Phased funding of infrastructure is required alongside development.
- Conditions and S106 Agreements.
- S106 Agreements to make contributions to cultural requirements.
- Need to define what is meant by key infrastructure.
- Provision of infrastructure should not be seen as an afterthought.
- Ensure budgets are in place, schemes cost-effective and contractors penalised if delays.
- Partly subsidised, co-operative distribution.
- Developers should pay.
- Organic step by step development allowing for necessary infrastructure to follow.
- Too much infrastructure in advance of development could lead to costly mistakes. Gradual phased growth allows for necessary infrastructure to catch-up.
- Set out priorities for infrastructure in supporting DPD, SPD, and AAP.
- See DoT Best Practice guidelines on Residential Travel Planning, e.g. ‘Manual for Streets’.
- Central and regional government should pay and deliver.
- Dependent on primary legislation a pooled planning gain levy for all built development.
- Avoid locations that are heavily dependent on infrastructure upgrade to deliver.
- Define infrastructure requirements to include emergency services, i.e. police, fire, and ambulance.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:**
Development should not proceed without a robust travel plan from developer.
Use S106 Agreements to secure extra school places.
Use Integrated Transport Strategy to set out developer contributions for transport infrastructure.
Developers to provide necessary infrastructure to deliver sustainable development at time of completion.

**GOWM:**
No comments received.

**WMRA:**
No comments received.

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**Highway Agency:** Infrastructure needs to be provided on a phased basis alongside development. Detailed program for the implementation of essential infrastructure is drawn up alongside Site Allocations DPD.

**Outstanding issues:**
Clearer definition of infrastructure requirements in JCS. How can wider LDF assist with infrastructure delivery, i.e. appropriate DPD and SPG, AAPs.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
Develop a policy on Travel Plans.

**Issue 12: How can affordable (e.g. rented or shared ownership) and special housing needs best be met?**

**Section 5: Meeting the Needs of All Generations**
### Summary of Questionnaire responses:

Option 1 All new housing is required to make a contribution towards affordable housing:
- Strongly Agree 32.6%
- Agree 40%
- Disagree 19.6%
- Strongly Disagree 7.7%

Option 2 Set thresholds for the size of development when affordable housing required and % targets for a proportion of affordable dwellings:
- Strongly Agree 27.2%
- Agree 57.7%
- Disagree 11.4%
- Strongly Disagree 3.7%

Option 3 Public organisations make greater use of their land, CPO powers to deliver affordable housing:
- Strongly Agree 21.4%
- Agree 40.6%
- Disagree 29%
- Strongly Disagree 9.1%

Option 4 Allocate 100% affordable developments on the edge of villages where there is a proven need:
- Strongly Agree 19%
- Agree 32.6%
- Disagree 31.5%
- Strongly Disagree 16.8%

Option 5 Allocate affordable housing sites in the main towns:
- Strongly Agree 24.1%
- Agree 53.5%
- Disagree 15.6%
- Strongly Disagree 6.8%

Strong level of support for all Options, in particular Option 1, 2 and 5. Significant level of support for public organisations making greater use of land and powers. Opinion equally divided concerning Option 4 allocation 100% affordable sites on village edges.

### Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:

- Level/size of contribution. Transparency, e.g. how can people understand how the thresholds are calculated.
- Broad support but issue is threshold level and % contribution of public land.
- Question support for CPO, though support in principle.
- Clarification required over affordable housing definitions. Evident that there is uncertainty as to type of housing required, not just social rented.
- How/who established proven need of affordable housing?
- Perpetuity – how to keep housing affordable in long-term.
- Should sites be allocated within villages.
- Ensure location/mix of tenure is sustainable.
- Availability/suitability of sites (e.g. Tenbury Wells and Upton-on-Severn due to flooding).
- Design quality of affordable housing.

### Summary of Responses from key consultees:

**Worcestershire County Council:**

Whilst Options generally in line with RSS Policy CF7 regard should be paid to the RSS expectation that local authorities should set minimum affordable housing targets, including separate targets for social rented and intermediate affordable housing, based on regional and South Housing Market Area Study targets.

Local authorities should set out criteria for S106 Agreements.

RSS Policy CF7 requires local authorities to keep affordable housing need under review and indicate approach to be taken to delivering affordable housing.

**GOWM:**

Commendable that housing affordability issue mentioned especially Malvern Hills District Council in respect of house price to earnings ratio. Expect to see South Housing Market Area Study evidence used as the strategy develops.

**WMRA:**

See Worcestershire County Council above.
Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):
None received.

Outstanding issues:
- Thresholds and percentages of affordable housing sought.
- Identifying split between social rented and intermediate housing.
- The allocation of sites in smaller towns and villages for 100% affordable housing and specific allocations of exceptions sites in rural areas.
- Determination of size of sites below which we seek financial contribution.

Where the evidence is taking us:
South Housing Market Area Report (paragraph 15.3.6) evidence suggests that a low threshold should be set due to high affordable housing needs. A high percentage of affordable housing is required, suggesting that a nil threshold be applied with financial contributions for sites below certain sizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 13: How can a suitable range of housing be provided to meet identified needs?</th>
<th>Section 5: Meeting the needs of future generations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Set targets for the size and types of housing as part of assessing all planning applications for residential development:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 28.8% Agree 53.5% Disagree 13.2% Strongly Disagree 4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 All development to provide a mix of housing sizes and types to reflect local needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 37.7% Agree 51.7% Disagree 7.1% Strongly Disagree 3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 Allow the building industry to decide the mix of housing types which should be provided:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 5.1% Agree 14.9% Disagree 37.8% Strongly Disagree 42.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 Promote homes which can be extended more easily to meet changing needs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 16.4% Agree 54.1% Disagree 22% Strongly Disagree 7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong overall support for all the Options.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need to enable local young people to get onto housing ladder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Issue of maintaining supply of smaller homes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need for sufficient housing for elderly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conflict between improved standard of design verses need to produce large number of homes with scarcity of land.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Issue over what is good housing design/sustainable construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Need to have affordable housing at other forms of housing levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Question over the ability of housing developers to meet local needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential for new settlement to provide mix of affordable housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Responses from key consultees:

Worcestershire County Council:
JCS should take account of RSS Policy CF8 and use sub regional Housing Market Area Study evidence to set out housing mix. Options 1,2 and 4 would be in line with RSS CF8 (Part C) while Option 3 would not. Issues 13 and 14 lack any spatial dimension i.e. providing for higher value housing in some settlements e.g. Worcester to retain those with well paid jobs.
**GOWM:**
See response to Issue 12.

**WMRA:**
See Worcestershire County Council’s comments above.

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**
None received.

**Outstanding issues:**
Identifying appropriate mix of housing to meet identified local need.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
South Worcestershire Housing Needs Report (15.5) suggests that there are various types of households whose needs would not be met by the building industry alone. There is a need for affordable housing to reflect accommodation required as identified in Local Housing Need Report. Develop policies to deliver affordable housing at set threshold and provide for rural exception sites.

**Issue 14: How can we improve the quality, flexibility and adaptability of housing across South Worcestershire?**

**Summary of Questionnaire responses:**
| Option 1 Require market housing schemes to contribute to improving existing housing stock: | Option 2 Encourage people to move to most suitable housing for their needs through allocation/promotion of specialist homes and developments: | Option 3 Only locate specialist homes for the elderly in locations which are accessible to facilities, services and public transport: | Option 4 All new development to include a proportion of dwellings to be constructed to ‘Lifetime Homes’ standard: | Option 5 Identify and designate existing housing areas for renewal/investment programmes: |
| Strongly Agree 27.5% Agree 36.8% Disagree 28.3% Strongly Disagree 7.5% | Strongly Agree 18.2% Agree 57.7% Disagree 19.7% Strongly Disagree 4.5% | Strongly Agree 42.1% Agree 47.1% Disagree 8.9% Strongly Disagree 1.8% | Strongly Agree 24.6% Agree 59.7% Disagree 13.1% Strongly Disagree 2.7% | Strongly Agree 25% Agree 64.6% Disagree 8% Strongly Disagree 2.4% |

Option 5 received the strongest level of support, followed by Option 3 and 4. Significant level of support given to Option 2 providing opportunities for people to ‘downsize’ and release housing stock. Support for Option 1 requiring developers to contribute to improving existing local housing.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**
- Questions over the principle and feasibility of mechanisms for developers of market housing to contribute to improving existing local housing.
- Mechanisms and incentives needed to encourage people to move to more suitable housing (e.g. downsizing) not compulsion.
- Overwhelming agreement that specialist housing should be sited in accessible locations, but new infrastructure can be introduced.
- Issue of Lifetime homes:
  - questions over impact on turnover and choice;
  - improving standards compared with increasing densities.
• Questions over whether private developers can be involved in the process of identifying and designating existing housing areas for renewal/investment programmes.
• In some other way:
  - improved and innovative design to higher standards;
  - greater mix of tenure and size.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:**
Options 2 and 3 seek to address problems with an ageing population in line with RSS Policy CF8 (Part B). But Options fail to address needs of other groups such as students. In Worcester students will become a ‘group’ which will increase in significance as University expands. Issues 13 and 14 lack any spatial dimension e.g. providing for higher value housing in some settlements e.g. Worcester to retain those with well paid jobs.

**GOWM:**
Generally, document does not reflect needs of children, young people or families (though this comment appears to relate mainly to education).

**WMRA:**
See Worcestershire County Council’s comments above.

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**
None received.

**Outstanding issues:**
Implementation of Option 1 and issue. Mechanism required to secure developer contribution to improving/upgrading of existing local housing stock.
Allocation of Extra Care Homes – should we be looking at proportion of a larger general housing site or for specifically designated site or combination of both?
Where do we allocate extra care homes – towns?
Long term viability of community/social/care facilities provided on extra care/specialist sites e.g. would local PCT support doctors surgeries on site?

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
Develop policy that sets a threshold for requirement of dwelling mix. Allocate parts of larger sites for range of appropriate mix of housing in Area Action Plans. Need should be measured against the Local Housing Needs Report for South Worcestershire.

**Issue 15: How can Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs be met?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</th>
<th>Section 5: Meeting the Needs of All Generations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Identify Gypsy and Traveller needs and broad locations where additional provision should be made:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 17.2% Agree 55.4% Disagree 14.1% Strongly Disagree 13.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Local authorities use CPO powers to deliver sites in appropriate locations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 13.4% Agree 32.6% Disagree 28.4% Strongly Disagree 25.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 strong support for the identification of Gypsy and Traveller needs and broad locations where additional provision should be made. Option 2 54% considered that Local Authorities should <strong>not</strong> use Compulsory Purchase Powers to deliver sites in appropriate locations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

- Consultation required with Gypsy and Travelling community, local community, parish councils:
  - small scale sites;
  - different types of sites including transit sites;
  - integration with local community where appropriate.
- Allocation of Gypsy and Traveller sites through consultation not compulsion.
- Other ways of meeting needs of Gypsies and Travellers:
  - encourage private investment rather than publicly funded.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:**
Option 1 generally accords with RSS Policy CF9. Whilst Option 2 is also in line this is just one tool amongst others to secure site provision and is not a stand alone policy option.

**GOWM:**
Concerns that there are no realistic spatial options for Gypsy and Traveller provision.

**WMRA:**
See Worcestershire County Council’s comments above.

**Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**British Waterways:** Some gypsies are water-based and their needs should be considered.

**Outstanding issues:**
How are gypsy matters to be dealt with in JCS given that RSS Phase 3 Revision is intending to amend policy on Gypsies and Travellers? Although the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) provides pitch requirements by district it does not put forward any guidance about possible locations other than indicating that they should be close to existing families and that there is a preference for small sites. This may be difficult politically since it means that those areas that already have a high number of Gypsy families e.g. Cleeve Prior will be under pressure to accommodate more. Also, the GTAA indicates a need for the identification of Temporary Stopping Places and sites to accommodate Travelling Showpeople.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
National/regional planning policy guidance (e.g. DCLG Circular 01/2006) and the evidence of the recent South Housing Market Area Study, GTAA indicates that the Joint Core Strategy will need to provide a firm indication of the possible locations for new sites. This needs to specifically identify locations in the Site Allocations DPD, and where applications for private gypsy sites may be considered. It will be also be necessary to demonstrate how the sites will be delivered.

**Issue 16: How can a secure employment sector be established which both protects ‘vulnerable’ elements e.g. engineering, manufacturing, food processing, but does not lead to an over reliance on them?**

**Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All**

**Summary of Questionnaire responses:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Promote and protect specific types of employment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 25%</td>
<td>Agree 63.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Support the role that ‘vulnerable sectors’ play in the wider national economy:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 20%</td>
<td>Agree 66.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Promote leisure and tourism developments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 27%</td>
<td>Agree 62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Work with others to provide starter units and premises for business expansion:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 27.5%</td>
<td>Agree 67.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 5</th>
<th>Work with important employers/industries to ensure their long-term retention within South Worcestershire:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 41.6%</td>
<td>Agree 55.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong overall support for all Options.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**
- Can not resist market forces and inducements to attract employers can fail.
- Support the farmers.
- Small business support including premises.
- Employment activities need to good access to transport networks.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:** Concerned that the Employment Land Review has concluded that an extension to the North Western Bypass is required to support development on the west side of the River Severn.

**GOWM:** No comments.

**WMRA:** In considering the level of provision of employment land the Joint Core Strategy should take account of RSS policies PA6 and PA6A.

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**Highways Agency:** Location of development should not adversely effect the function (flow of traffic) of the strategic highway network.

**AWM:** May need to consider a Regional Investment Site allocation to meet future employment need demand. Low amount of office space in Worcester may affect growth adversely.

**Outstanding issues:**
- How much employment land should be allocated and how, single use or mixed use?
- Are the Regional Spatial Strategy figures to be observed or is the Employment Land Review the best evidence?
- How do we manage existing site allocations and B1 office proposals on greenfield out of centre sites

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
Employment land allocations in line with the ELR not the Regional Spatial Strategy. However this would not provide flexibility to meet unanticipated needs, e.g. large
local business needs to relocate to a larger site. Relocation of Kays is an example of a loss of a local employer due to a lack of suitable sites for employment led development. Consideration of existing allocations to ensure new housing areas have employment opportunities within or adjacent to residents homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 17: To what extent should existing employment areas be protected?</th>
<th>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1  Protect all employment sites:</td>
<td><strong>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 17.3%</td>
<td>Agree 40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 37.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree 4.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2  Protect all sites over 0.4ha:</td>
<td><strong>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 13.9%</td>
<td>Agree 45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 37.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree 3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3  Require developers to demonstrate that continued employment use is not viable before letting sites go for other uses:</td>
<td><strong>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 38.7%</td>
<td>Agree 46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 10.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree 1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support for Option 1 and 2, with significant support for Option 3. Short Questionnaire responses favour protection of all employment sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:</th>
<th><strong>Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review sites on their individual merits.</td>
<td>• Some support for forcing landowners/developers to re-develop in a way that supports as many jobs as the previous use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transport and other networks, e.g. broadband as important as protection</td>
<td>• Let the market decide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Responses from key consultees:</th>
<th><strong>Summary of Responses from key consultees:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worcestershire County Council:</td>
<td>Before employment sites are re-used for other purposes, developer must prove no longer viable as an employment site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOWM:</td>
<td>No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMRA:</td>
<td>Options 1 and 2 would not be in compliance with Regional Spatial Strategy Policy PA6B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):</th>
<th><strong>Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Outstanding issues: | NA |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where the evidence is taking us:</th>
<th><strong>Where the evidence is taking us:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A policy that sets tests for any change of use application to pass before approval will be granted. This could be a general policy applying to any change of use or one specific to changes of use from the ‘B Use Classes’.</td>
<td><strong>Where the evidence is taking us:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 18: How can our rural economy be strengthened?</th>
<th>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1  Promote new tourism and leisure developments:</td>
<td><strong>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strongly Agree 28.8% Agree 58% Disagree 12.2% Strongly Disagree 1%
Option 2 Encourage the development of small business premises and Live/Work units:
Strongly Agree 28% Agree 65.4% Disagree 5.8% Strongly Disagree 0.8%
Option 3 Encourage people to work from home:
Strongly Agree 25.8% Agree 60.3% Disagree 13.1% Strongly Disagree 0.8%
Option 4 Support farm diversification proposals:
Strongly Agree 30.4% Agree 61.4% Disagree 7.3% Strongly Disagree 0.9%
Option 5 Support small scale/appropriate expansion of rural businesses:
Strongly Agree 28.2% Agree 69.3% Disagree 2% Strongly Disagree 0.5%
Option 6 Encourage development of environmental technologies, e.g. wood chip for energy:
Strongly Agree 36.5% Agree 57.4% Disagree 4.6% Strongly Disagree 1.6%
Option 7 Establish more flexible policies in the Rural Regeneration Zone (RZZ):
Strongly Agree 23.2% Agree 60.5% Disagree 13.6% Strongly Disagree 2.7%

Strong overall support for all of the Options.

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:
- Development in rural areas should enhance the character of the countryside.
- Do we need a policy to help the extension of broadband services in rural areas?
- Support farmers core business, over emphasis of farm diversification can be detrimental to this.
- Positively worded policies required which encourage economic development
- Promotion of employment in towns Category 1 settlements effective to strengthen rural area; new business should be sustainable.
- Appropriateness of Rural Regeneration Zone policies.

Summary of Responses from key consultees:
Worcestershire County Council: Add further Option recognising robust, sustainable agriculture and local food production is a key to a holistic sustainable approach.

GOWM: No comments received.

WMRA: Policies that specifically apply to the Rural Regeneration Zone must be in compliance with Regional Spatial Strategy Policy RR2.
Policies need to:
- identify inter-relationship between urban and rural areas in appropriate settlement hierarchy, and identify different spatial strategies that prioritise rural renaissance;
- identify network of towns and focus rural renaissance objectives through them to regenerate rural areas;
- improve the range and quality of rural services;
- Recognise continuing importance of agriculture, promote agriculture/farm diversification and innovative business;
- Support sustainable diversification and development of rural economy.

Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):
English Heritage: The contribution of the historic environment to the rural economy should be included in this issue.

Outstanding issues:
- How do we write a spatial rural development policy that is locally distinctive and is in compliance with the Regional Spatial Strategy and National Policy?
What more should we be doing for the rural areas in policy terms given the current Local Plans policy approaches which balance the diversification of the rural economy with the need to protect and enhance the character of the rural area?

Where the evidence is taking us:
It is acknowledged that the Employment Land Review is not strong on rural issues, only addresses small windfall employment sites and home based businesses.

Issue 19: How should the retail provision in South Worcestershire be developed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</th>
<th>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1</strong> Direct major retail development to Worcester city centre:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 17.6% Agree 31.5% Disagree 42.6% Strongly Disagree 8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 2</strong> Direct major retail development to Worcester city and main towns:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 23% Agree 52.5% Disagree 20.4% Strongly Disagree 4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 3</strong> Direct retail development to the main towns:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 15.8% Agree 42.1% Disagree 36.6% Strongly Disagree 5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 4</strong> Safeguard rural shops and stores:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 55% Agree 41% Disagree 3.1% Strongly Disagree 0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 5</strong> Promote retail as an alternative use on underused and accessible urban employment sites, within or adjacent to shopping centres:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 15.6% Agree 57.5% Disagree 22% Strongly Disagree 4.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 6</strong> Strictly control any further proposals for out of town retail centres:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 52.7% Agree 30.6% Disagree 21.1% Strongly Disagree 4.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 7</strong> Encourage some retail development in rural locations to enable larger villages to act as service centres for rural communities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 22.1% Agree 60.5% Disagree 11.8% Strongly Disagree 5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 8</strong> Promote local shops on large scale residential and employment developments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 41.1% Agree 55.1% Disagree 3.6% Strongly Disagree 0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong support for Option 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**
- Local owner/occupied shops are more popular than chain stores.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:** Options 4, 5 and 6 supported.

**GOWM:** No specific comment.

**WMRA:**
- Option 3 is contrary to Regional Spatial Strategy Policy PA11 that requires major retail development to be directed to Worcester.
- Option 5 if pursued would need to recognise Policies PA6B, PA11, PA12A, PA12B and PA13 of the Regional Spatial Strategy.
- Option 6 may not comply with Regional Spatial Strategy Policy PA13

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**
**English Heritage,** support Options 4, 6, 7 and 8 and ensure the historic environment is enhanced to improve the distinctiveness of the retail experience.

**Outstanding issues:**
- What can be done to promote specialist and local retail opportunities,
Where the evidence is taking us:

- A policy that promotes a retail offer that satisfies local needs while at the same time strengthening the role of Market Towns and Worcester to allow them to fulfill their role as the primary focus for comparison shopping in South Worcestershire.

### Issue 20: How should South Worcestershire’s city and town centres develop?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</th>
<th>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Promote new office developments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 7.3% Agree 46.1% Disagree 40.8% Strongly Disagree 5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Promote city and town centres as tourism and leisure destinations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 28.2% Agree 63.6% Disagree 6.7% Strongly Disagree 1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 Protect and enhance the leisure, office, education and retail uses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 25.1% Agree 69.7% Disagree 4.2% Strongly Disagree 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 Promote residential uses e.g. accommodation above shops and offices:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 34.9% Agree 58.4% Disagree 5.9% Strongly Disagree 0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 Promote the evening economy e.g. cinemas, wine bars etc. as a means of improving vitality:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 27.4% Agree 56.6% Disagree 13.8% Strongly Disagree 2.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong overall support for all the Options, particularly Options 2 to 5.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

- Mixed uses, reuse of existing buildings, higher density development.
- Provide an evening economy with a broad appeal.
- Improve traffic management in town centres.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:** For Worcester and the Market Towns need to focus on people, not vehicles to enhance the quality of the environment. Promote city/town centres to people in conjunction with sustainable transport and services. Include demand management measures to include:

- Restructuring of central parking. Move long stay to edge of centre and park and ride and interchange 'hubs'.
- Promote high turnover, short stay parking.
- Parking control zones if needed.
- Provide passenger transport, cycle, walk, priority access into/ across city and towns.
- Provide a good mix of land uses.

**GOWM:** No specific comment but they expect the inter relationship between the towns and their functions to be set out in the Joint Core Strategy.

**WMRA:** If Option 1 is pursued then it would need to demonstrate compliance with Regional Spatial Strategy Policies PA10, PA11, PA12A, PA12B and PA13A.

**Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**English Heritage:** Combine all the options with emphasis given to Options 3 and 4.

**Outstanding issues:**

What is the best policy approach to reduce out commuting and expenditure leakage?
Where the evidence is taking us:
A policy that seeks to re-enforce the role of Worcester and the main towns while also protecting rural shops and services.

Issue 21: How can we improve the quality of our town centres?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 6: Economic Success that is Shared by All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Questionnaire responses:
Option 1  Encourage more independent stores and outlets:
Strongly Agree 49%  Agree 46.6%  Disagree 4.1%  Strongly Disagree 0.3%
Option 2  Encourage more national high street retailers, by providing larger shop units:
Strongly Agree 9.3%  Agree 38%  Disagree 43%  Strongly Disagree 9.6%
Option 3  Improve the public spaces e.g. more vehicle free areas:
Strongly Agree 32.4%  Agree 52.4%  Disagree 13%  Strongly Disagree 2.2%
Option 4  Improve access by public transport:
Strongly Agree 52.6%  Agree 43.1%  Disagree 3.8%  Strongly Disagree 0.5%
Option 5  Increase car parking:
Strongly Agree 21.7%  Agree 44.1%  Disagree 26.8%  Strongly Disagree 7.4%
Option 6  Identify retail led regeneration and enhancement schemes for town centres:
Strongly Agree 21.6%  Agree 62.8%  Disagree 12.8%  Strongly Disagree 2.9%

Strong support for Option 1, 3, 4, and 6.

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:
- All development should enhance the character of town and city centres e.g. farmers markets.
- Increase traffic management and Park and Ride.

Summary of Responses from key consultees:

Worcestershire County Council: Improve public transport to reduce car volumes. Enhance public spaces, reduce severance effect of heavy traffic by greater use of shared road space, and priority orders for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users.

GOWM: No specific comment but the vision should set out the ambitions for the future development of the principal centres.

WMRA: Option 5 is not in conformity with Regional Spatial Strategy Policy T7

Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):

English Heritage: Support Options 1, 3 and 4. A fundamental element of any Preferred Option must be protecting and enhancing the distinctive historic character of each of the main town centres.

Outstanding issues: NA

Where the evidence is taking us:
To be locally distinctive policy needed that emphasises local shops while ensuring it is still in compliance with the Regional Spatial Strategy and PPS6 ‘Planning for Town Centres’.
### Issue 22: How should we promote tourism and culture/leisure?

**Summary of Questionnaire responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong overall support, particularly for Option 1, 4, and 5.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

- No consensus on where new facilities should be developed. You could conclude that tourism and leisure development is the one form of development that people do want in their back yard.
- Tourism facilities need to be appropriate to the location, too much tourism could damage the value of the attraction.
- Making better use of rivers and canals seems to cut across the whole South Worcestershire area.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

- **Worcestershire County Council:** Support Option 1, 5, and 6. Ensure that tourist/leisure attractions are linked to main town/city centres by attractive/direct pedestrian routes. Multiple smaller tourism opportunities may be preferable.
- **GOWM:** No comment received.
- **WMRA:** No comment received.

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

- **English Heritage:** A combination of Options 1, 4 and 5 should inform the preferred option with an overarching commitment to sustainable tourism which capitalises on the environmental economy of the area and surrounding districts.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**

A policy that supports existing facilities and enables their development providing this does not produce negative externalities, e.g. traffic congestion or job insecurity. This Issue offers an opportunity for a locally distinctive policy based on specific features, attractions of South Worcestershire.

### Issue 23: How do we conserve, enhance and restore the biodiversity of South Worcestershire?

**Summary of Questionnaire responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Where the evidence is taking us:**

A policy that supports existing facilities and enables their development providing this does not produce negative externalities, e.g. traffic congestion or job insecurity. This Issue offers an opportunity for a locally distinctive policy based on specific features, attractions of South Worcestershire.
biodiversity:
Strongly Agree 37.8% Agree 47.9% Disagree 13.7% Strongly Disagree 0.6%
Option 2 Identify priorities for biodiversity:
Strongly Agree 45.4% Agree 49.2% Disagree 4.1% Strongly Disagree 1.3%
Option 3 Allow some development on sites of local biodiversity importance as long
as the developer fully compensates for any losses:
Strongly Agree 9.9% Agree 28.5% Disagree 37.6% Strongly Disagree 23.9%
Option 4 Ensure that all development is designed to accommodate and improve
biodiversity:
Strongly Agree 40.1% Agree 48.7% Disagree 8% Strongly Disagree 3.1%

Overwhelming support for protecting, enhancing and re-creating important
biodiversity sites, and seeking contributions from developers to achieve it.

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:
- Strong support for the protection of the existing biodiversity features and the
  creation of new areas.
- Whatever is done for biodiversity sites need to be maintained thereafter.
- Geo-diversity is missing.
- A profitable agricultural industry is the best safeguard for biodiversity.
- Biodiversity should be enhanced by means of linked planting in the form of
trees, hedgerows, and water areas taking care to ensure that these conform
to landscape character guidance.

Summary of Responses from key consultees:
Worcestershire County Council: Preferred Options will need to address PPS9
‘Biodiversity’ beyond designated sites. Need study of historic assets. Some minor
rewording suggested.
GOWM: No comments received.
WMRA: Option 3 would not be in conformity with RSS Policies QE1 iii 7 iv and QE7i.
However RSS QE policies may be subject to change in RSS Phase 3 Revision.

Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue
raised, if any):
- Worcestershire Nature Conservation Trust: Supports Option 2 to identify
priorities that do not cover just statutory protected habitats. Some
irreplaceable semi-natural habitats like ancient woodland still do not have
comprehensive protection. To ensure the ancient tree heritage continues in a
sustainable way so that future generations will be able to enjoy the benefits.
Important that an increase in the cumulative core area of semi-natural
habitats as a whole in the landscape.

Outstanding issues:
Develop a stronger emphasis on historic environment, and the prioritising of sites
that do not have statutory protection.

Where the evidence is taking us:
The protection, enhancement and recreation of biodiversity habitats are a high
priority.

Issue 24: How do we conserve, enhance and restore the
landscape character of South Worcestershire?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</th>
<th>Section: Better Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Option 1 Protect, conserve, restore and enhance only statutory protected
  landscapes, e.g. AONB: | | |
| Strongly Agree 25.6% Agree 21.8% Disagree 39.6% Strongly Disagree 12.9% | | |
| Option 2 Protect the character of the open countryside around urban areas using
  policies such as Landscape Buffers and Strategic Gaps: | | |
Strongly Agree  46.3%  Agree  46.8%  Disagree 5.1%  Strongly Disagree  1.7%
Option 3  Protect, conserve and enhance the rural landscape character and local
distinctiveness of South Worcestershire:
Strongly Agree  60.4%  Agree  36.7%  Disagree  2.4%  Strongly Disagree  0.5%

Overwhelming support for Option 3, significant objection to Option 1.

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:

- Protect Green Belt and create landscape buffers and Strategic Gaps
- Add documents to evidence base – Use Biodiversity and Geodiversity Action Plans, Countryside Landscape Assessments, Green Infrastructure Study etc.
- More active management of the countryside - Management Plans, guidelines on design, increased enforcement, restoration of hedgerows and mature trees etc. and encourage planting schemes.
- Enhancement of landscape character through development schemes - Developer contributions and incorporation of green spaces
- Protections for the rural landscape as a whole not just statutory designations. Through enhancement of landscape character and local distinctiveness.
- Promote and support agriculture to assist preservation of landscape character.

Summary of Responses from key consultees:

Worcestershire County Council:
- Needs to consider the condition of landscape as well as visual impact.
- Require a study of the full range of historic assets.
- Issue 24 should refer to the role of the historic landscape e.g. buried archaeological remains.

GOWM: No significant comments.

WMRA: Options 1 and 2 of Issue 24 are contrary to Regional Spatial Strategy Policies QE6 and QE7.

Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):

AONB Partnership
- AONB Management Plan 2004-9 should be acknowledged in Joint Core Strategy.
- PPS and National Policies need to be translated into more local policies.

English Heritage
- Support Option 3 but emphasis that historic assets and historic character of the landscape are fundamental to the landscape character.
**Outstanding issues:**

English Heritage is concerned that the historic environment of South Worcestershire is not explicitly addressed as a core component of this section (Better Environment). This is a significant omission that must be tackled in subsequent stages of developing the preferred option.

This issue is repeated in Worcestershire County Council’s comments relating to the need for a study of the full range of historic assets and specifically that Issue 24 should refer to the role of the historic landscape (e.g. archaeological remains).

The questionnaire comments show that there was confusion between the focus of Issue 24 and Issue 26. People found it difficult to distinguish between the ‘Landscape Character’ of Issue 24 and ‘Environment’ of Issue 26.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**

Strong support for Option 3 and recognition for protecting the rural landscape as a whole through enhancement of landscape character and local distinctiveness.

This will require an improved definition of the character/distinctiveness of the landscape of South Worcestershire.

### Issue 25: How do we reduce the risk of, and adapt to the changing pattern of flooding.

#### Section: Better Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Adopt stricter standards regarding where building could take place than currently used, i.e. 1 in 200 year flood:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree: 56.7% Agree 32.6% Disagree 9.3% Strongly Disagree 1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Introduce design approaches that can tolerate or adapt to flooding:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 36.2% Agree 48% Disagree 12.8% Strongly Disagree 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 Allow development in areas subject to surface run-off, provided the problem is addressed as part of the development:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 17.1% Agree 49.1% Disagree 25.8% Strongly Disagree 8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4 Include a policy for the collection, storage and re-use of rainwater in new development:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 46.1% Agree 48.4% Disagree 4.1% Strongly Disagree 1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5 Ensure sufficient space/landscaping in developments to minimise flooding, i.e. Sustainable Drainage Systems:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 53.4% Agree 43.5% Disagree 2.4% Strongly Disagree 0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6 Ensure new key infrastructure, e.g. electricity sub-stations are located outside flood areas:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 68.5% Agree 29.4% Disagree 1.8% Strongly Disagree 0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 7 Prohibit the redevelopment of sited within the flood zone:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 52.1% Agree 30% Disagree 14.3% Strongly Disagree 3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 8 Seek contributions from developers towards flood protection and alleviation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 43.5% Agree 41.4% Disagree 11.7% Strongly Disagree 3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant majority agreed in adopting stricter standards, above EA, to where building can take place. Also strong support for design approaches that are flooding tolerant in flood risk locations.

Agreement that development could be considered in areas subject to surface run-off provided it is addressed by the development.
Strong support for water recovery, SuDS, and setting aside open space to ameliorate flood risk.
New key infrastructure to be located outside areas of flooding [probably influenced by near flooding of electricity sub-station flood at Tewkesbury in July 2007].
Strong agreement to restrict development in flood plain.
Large majority in favour of development contribution towards flood alleviation.

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:
- Need to give consideration to water quality/infrastructure provision, e.g. refer to County Council’s forthcoming paper on ‘Planning for Water’.
- Address problems associated with existing properties – remedial work to limit flood impact.
- Reference should be made to flood management at a river catchment scale and scope for localised river and stream restoration.
- Create wash back areas near to river systems.
- Funding required from central government to address the problem
- Compulsory demolition of property in flood plains to return them to original purpose.
- Through innovative design it is possible to build in the flood plain.
- Maintain and clean up ditches/minor water courses to ensure effectiveness
- Address recent changes in farming practice and reinstate grants to maintain ditches etc.
- Minimise hard surfaces in developments to reduce run-off.
- More flood barriers and barrages.

Summary of Responses from key consultees:

**Worcestershire County Council:** Insufficient attention is given to water quality and infrastructure. Matters relating to flood alleviation are covered in ‘Development Guide’ and broad support for all Options. It is essential that new developments provides adequate drainage and where appropriate upgrade existing facilities downstream to ensure sufficient capacity. Important to utilise all available land in the flood plain, CPO land if necessary to do this. Where development has design in flood alleviation they should be permitted. Consider change of land use to facilitate flood mitigation.

**GOWM:** No comment.

**WMRA:** Option 7 may not accord with existing RSS position that advocates a sequential approach as required by PPS25 ‘Development and Flood Risk’. This could allow for certain development within the flood plain, and not a blanket ban as proposed by Option 7.

**Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**Environment Agency:** Support Option 3 to 8 providing there is a reduction including betterment in the wider surface water regime and or surface water infrastructure. The expectation would be for development contributions to deliver flood defences, and SuDS to be covered by separate DPD/SPD.

**Outstanding issues:** Further consideration should be given to water quality and water delivery infrastructure. Essential to secure Environment Agency involvement at the Technical Meetings and through out the Preferred and Submitted Options stages.
Where the evidence is taking us: This is an issue where the Preferred Option will be significantly guided by PPS25 and Regional Spatial Strategy policies and Environment Agency. But also consider policies relating to innovative design solutions and restoration of water catchment/flood plains etc.

NB several comments made in Issue 26 were also made in Issues 23 and 24 and where appropriate these comments have been cross-analysed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 26: How should we be improving the environment of South Worcestershire?</th>
<th>Section: Better Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1  Define the local character of the built environment within the city, towns and villages and require this to be respected in all new development:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 53.4%  Agree 44%  Disagree 1.7%  Strongly Disagree 0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2  Protect areas of private garden land that contribute to local character:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 49.3%  Agree 40.4%  Disagree 8.8%  Strongly Disagree 1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3  Protect important views of significant landscape features and buildings that contribute to the character of South Worcestershire:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree 62.8%  Agree 34.2%  Disagree 2.4%  Strongly Disagree 0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongest support for Option 3. Support for Option 1, and least support Option 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Questionnaire - Question K Space and other private Green spaces be protected? Had an overwhelming response in support of Issue 26, Options 2 and 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority agreed to protect important views of significant landscape features and buildings, and any proposed development should reflect the present / further define the local character of the built environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**

- Design and Character was the most discussed theme and respondents seemed to value its importance very highly. Particular emphasis was placed on protecting existing buildings of character whilst at the same time constructing new building in keeping with the local character of South Worcestershire (cited example ‘Oxford City Local Plan’). Furthering this idea another respondent discussed the importance of recognising the character of the countryside as well as the built environment.

- When discussing local character the word “evolve” was used on several occasions, with specific reference to meeting modern community needs, climate change commitments and contemporary lifestyles.

- The Joint Core Strategy should be driving the standard of design, possibly using CABE style statements, both within the Built Environment (to ensure that developers do not build unimaginative historical design, generic and/or inappropriate architecture) and the Natural Environment.

- There were two comments that highlighted the need to encourage parish planning, advocating these documents offer invaluable local information. Other comments looked at further engaging the public/communities and encouraging them to assess their own local area’s character and how it should grow. A respondent suggested promoting a design competition for
significant developments and seeks public views as a way of improving public participation.

- Three comments stated their resistance to any further proposed growth.
- Four questions were asked of 7.26.2:
  1. Agree, but at what expense of freedom of choice.
  2. Demolition of low density for high density dwellings can detract from the environmental quality of the area.
  3. Does this mean prohibiting owners of large gardens selling off for new houses?
  4. Not as an exclusive policy.
- The general theme - private gardens should not be made available for development.
- Protect, improve accessibility and increase public spaces as the population grows.
- Two comments were received concerning views both highlighting the importance to maintain key strategic views in to and out of significant landscape features and buildings. Given example were the long distance views from Croome Park.
- The Natural Environment theme raises the issue that if there is to be a Built Environment Issue, in the revised paper, then there needs to be a corresponding Natural Environment Issue to consider, with the deletion of the biodiversity issue as a result (it fits into the natural environment). This seems to have confused many respondents and as such many comments made in Issue 26 were also made in Issue 23.
- A proposed Natural Environment Issue should be: The support of, and full involvement in, the development and implementation of Worcestershire’s Biodiversity and Geodiversity Action Plans.
- A number of comments highlighted the misleading nature of the question. The question asks how should we be improving the environment of South Worcestershire? However the Issue and Option Paper only talked about the built environment.
- Only Option 1 is any use. Option 2 considered unworkable. If the owner of a 'protected' garden moves or dies or ceases to garden and the contribution to local character declines as a result, does the land then cease to be protected?
- CONCLUSION – Design and Character was the most discussed theme and respondents seemed to value their importance very highly. Issue 26 confusing, a better distinction between the built and natural environment needs to be made.

Letters - The main themes to come forward are as follows:

- Support option – Protecting important views.
- Protect the varied rural characteristics of the settlements of South Worcestershire by ensuring that the scale and location of development is in keeping with their size, character and function, whilst ensuring development is sustainable by the efficient design and use of land.
To conserve, restore and enhance biodiversity, geodiversity, landscape character, air, soil and water quality.

The historic environment of South Worcestershire is not explicitly addressed as a core component of this section. This is a significant omission that should be tackled in subsequent stages of developing the preferred option.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:** Should also refer to the historic character of a locality.

**GOWM:** No significant comments in relation to the Better Environment section.

**WMRA:** No significant comments in relation to Issue 26.

**Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

**AONB Management Board:** Good design important regarding Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty therefore additional design guidance would be useful in form of Supplementary Planning Document. Need to recognise important views from, as well as to, the Malvern Hills/Bredon Hills/Cotswold escarpment.

**Worcester City Council’s Archaeological Service:** Urban, suburban and other landscapes also merit protection in many cases. Option 1, hard to see why it scores negatively. Defining character is a positive step towards sustaining character and local distinctiveness.

Defining character is currently happening with the Worcestershire Historic Landscape Characterisation for the W... and local distinctiveness.

Option 2 is reactive.

**Outstanding issues:**

There has been some interpretation of Issues 23, 24 (natural environment) and 26 (built environment), where some felt that Issue 26 was not explicit enough. The confusion is due to the fact that the Issue refers to the environment, whilst the detailed options only seem to refer to the built environment.

Preferred Option stage needs to ensure this confusion is dealt with a clearly defined natural environment option and a built environment option.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**

The need to recognise important views in to and out of AONB/significant landscape features and buildings (highest questionnaire support for Option 3).

The need to clearly define the landscape character of South Worcestershire’s and using this to build locally distinctive buildings and landscapes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 27: How can we increase our sources of renewable energy and conserve existing energy?</th>
<th>Section 7: Better Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Identify locations where renewable energy sites will be encouraged:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree: 32.1% Agree 52.2% Disagree 11% Strongly Disagree 4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Set targets for including renewable energy in all developments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree: 37.4% Agree 47.6% Disagree 12.3% Strongly Disagree 2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3 Ensure all new development uses local, re-used and/or sustainable produced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building materials:
Strongly Agree: 39.3% Agree 44.4% Disagree 14.2% Strongly Disagree 2.1%

Option 4 Require BREEAM 'excellent' standard and meet Code for Sustainable Homes level 6 by 2016:
Strongly Agree: 39.1% Agree 50.5% Disagree 8.1% Strongly Disagree 2.3%

Option 5 Provide clear planning guidance to support the production of energy through recycling of waste:
Strongly Agree: 49.8% Agree 45.4% Disagree 3.3% Strongly Disagree 1.65

Overwhelming support for all of the Options proposed.

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:

Option 1
- Some support for ‘energy crops’ although concern that the cultivation may result in food shortages, requiring limits on extent of growing 'energy crops' in place of food production.
- Some concern that the use of energy crops and wind generation may be discredited in the future.
- Limited support for wind generation with concerns over the amount of energy generated versus the need to protect the landscape amenity and the visual impact, some felt major coastal installations would be better.
- Most supported were alternative renewable energy methods including: agricultural waste for electricity generation; solar panels; Ground Source Heating; Hydro Power from the River Severn and River Avon; Combined Heat and Power Schemes (district power schemes); and microgeneration.

Option 2
- Support for requiring renewable energy in all developments.
- Concern over how targets could be set.
- Require large sites to be 'eco sites'.

Option 3
- Some support for using re-used / sustainable materials although limited concern over availability of materials.

Option 4
- Some concern over difficulty in meeting such high standards across the board and the implications on the cost of developing homes, in particular affordable homes.
- Strong support for new energy efficient homes, that incorporate renewable technologies and reduce energy consumption.
- Strong support for subsidies and grants to support retrofitting existing housing stock and the need to actively promote energy conservation and energy efficiency across all types of development.
- Suggestion that this was not needed in the Joint Core Strategy as duplicates national guidance.
- Several suggestions to encourage surface water storage and collection including retrofitting these measures to existing stock.

Option 5
- Strong support for the production of energy from household waste and other processed waste (agricultural/industrial), to help reduce landfill.
- Support for increasing recycling opportunities.
- Recognised a need for clear guidance on the reduction of waste including discouraging excessive packaging.
• Concern that waste incineration is not recycling and is harmful to the environment and that recycling costs energy and does not produce it.

Summary of Responses from key consultees:
Worcestershire County Council:
• Issue of promoting renewable energy is welcomed but recommend that the Preferred Option should make this subservient to steps to reduce energy use and energy efficiency.
• Agree there is a need to set targets for the reduction of carbon emissions.
• Suggest we include more information on sustainable construction standards and retrofitting on existing developments.
• Ensure development uses local / recycled materials, although concern that County has enough to meet demand.
• Welcome the inclusion of the requirement for BREEAM and CSH accreditation.
• PPS 22 does not regard energy from waste as a renewable source of energy.

GOWM: No comments received.

WMRA:
• Suggest that energy from waste should not be addressed in the Joint Core Strategy instead it is the remit of the Worcestershire County Council’s Waste Core Strategy.

Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):
English Heritage: Concern over the potential impact of renewable energy installations on the historic resources of South Worcestershire and propose that it needs to be taken account of in the Preferred Options stage.

Advantage West Midlands: Wish to see low carbon energy promoted in urban extensions.

Environment Agency: Water efficiency should also be considered within this Issue, and would be pleased to see water efficiency targets linked with the Code for Sustainable Homes and that all new developments of over 20 homes should contribute to retrofitting water efficiency measures to existing homes.

British Waterways: Propose that Hydropower is viable on Rivers Avon, Teme and Severn, and would encourage greater use of waterways for transportation.

Outstanding issues:
Question over energy from waste being a renewable source and whether this should be addressed by Joint Core Strategy at all.

Where the evidence is taking us:
Recognised need and support for addressing renewable energy within the Joint Core Strategy, both strategically and in terms of individual properties.
Need to ensure that buildings are built using sustainable techniques e.g. CFS, BREEAM – need to avoid duplication of national policy.
Ensure that we attempt to address climate change with policies that cover both adaptation and mitigation to climate changes. How can we improve existing energy efficiency?

Issue 28: Where should new waste management facilities be provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Locate most new waste treatment facilities on any land suitable for general industrial uses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Summary of Questionnaire responses:
The greatest support is for Option 3. Most objections to Option 2.
Locations of Resource Recovery Park – Throckmorton, Norton, Blackpole, Worcester,
Extend existing sites/ industrial estates e.g. Hill and Moor.
Location of Waste Management Facilities: Throckmorton, Norton, away from residential
development, industrial estates, local sites to reduce travel, near to/extend existing e.g.
Hill and Moor.

**Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:**
- Should there be local waste management sites, or fewer large sites, or a combination.
- Existing sites should be expanded.
- Need to tackle source of waste.
- Encourage other forms of waste treatment.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:** ‘waste management facilities’ should be located where transport links to the site is most suitable. Only one site in an area could increase mileage.

**GOWM:** No comment received.

**WMRA:** None of Options in Issue 28 can be addressed in SWJCS i.e. Worcestershire County Council responsibility to allocate. RSS does not encourage production of energy from waste.

**Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):**

Wychavon District Councillor – suggested location of new waste treatment across county to prevent large-scale waste movements.

**Outstanding issues:**
How much do we cover of the Waste/Minerals Core Strategies? The extent to which the Joint Core Strategy duplicates County Council’s waste management role.

**Where the evidence is taking us:**
Besides the deciding on the location of new waste facilities, there is a need to tackle the sources of waste/encourage other forms of waste treatment. Requirement to liaise with County Council on this matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue 29: How do we promote an accessible network of green open space?</th>
<th>Section: Improving Health and Wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1  Continue to develop a network of linked green space in all the main urban areas:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strongly Agree 47% Agree 49.2% Disagree 3.2% Strongly Disagree 0.6%
Option 2 Develop a single standard of provision of formal open space for sport and recreation throughout South Worcestershire:
Strongly Agree 18.7% Agree 45.5% Disagree 34% Strongly Disagree 1.9%
Option 3 Develop standards of provision based on local circumstances and need:
Strongly Agree 26.5% Agree 64.4% Disagree 8.9% Strongly Disagree 0.2%
Option 4 Protect all areas of public green open space and other important private green open space:
Strongly Agree 50.9% Agree 39.3% Disagree 8.9% Strongly Disagree 0.9%
Option 5 Seek contributions from developers for play, sport and recreation facilities, both indoor and outdoor from housing and commercial development:
Strongly Agree 44% Agree 44.3% Disagree 9.6% Strongly Disagree 2%

Strong overall support for all these Options.

**Summary of Questionnaire comments:**
- Promote distinctive character of green spaces.
- Make use of, protect and extend existing green spaces.
- Create more cycle routes.
- Improve developer contributions.

**Summary of Responses from key consultees:**

**Worcestershire County Council:**
- When developing a network of green open space, reference could be made to Access to Land section of the ‘Worcestershire Countryside Access and Recreation Strategy’ (WCC).
- A clear and positive approach will be necessary to create policy that protects the character of the landscape.

**GOWM:**
- There is no mention of the importance of schools, children’s centres, youth facilities being at the heart of communities both town and rural.

**WMRA:**
- Need to ensure the quality of the environment is conserved and enhanced across all parts of the region.
- Issue 29, Option 1 focuses on developing a network of linked green space in all the main urban areas. The Joint Core Strategy should also address the issue of linking new ‘urban greenspaces’ to the wider countryside in line with Part B iii) of Regional Spatial Strategy Policy QE4.
- Issue 29, Option 4 seeks the protection of all areas of green open space, and other important private green open space, this is generally in accordance with existing Regional Spatial Strategy Policy QE4 BI.

**Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations:**

RSS: Policy QE1 ii) and iv), Policy QE4, Policy QE6, Policy T3.

Longer responses from consultees:
- “An open space audit should be used to determine what provision new developments should make to existing and new facilities”: Agent.
- “Protect green open space but extend policy to recognise the health benefits of the open countryside. Developer contributions could be used to enhance recreation in the countryside”. Malvern Hills AONB Partnership.
Object to the loss of green areas within cities. Green spaces provide a safety valve for people. The school closest to where I live has now lost all of its playing fields. South Worcestershire resident.

Outstanding issues: None.

Where the evidence is taking us:
Develop policy that preserves and enhances green space, public open space and green infrastructure network, linking in with cycle/footpath routes. Set standards locally in-line with PPG17 ‘Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation’ and findings of PMP alignment study.

Issue 30: How should healthcare needs be met in association with new development?

Summary of Questionnaire responses:
Option 1 Provide new facilities in locations identified for significant growth, in partnership with social/health care providers:
   Strongly Agree: 45.8% Agree: 48.8% Disagree 4.4% Strongly Disagree 1.1%
Option 2 Increase capacity of existing primary healthcare resources in partnership with social/health care providers:
   Strongly Agree: 34.1% Agree: 52.7% Disagree 11.8% Strongly Disagree 1.5%

Significant majority agreed with both Option 1 and Option 2.

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:
- Mobile healthcare service for rural areas.
- Developers contribute to cost of such facilities.
- Have all health care facilities centralised- sustainable locations.
- Build a new hospital at Malvern.
- Only improve existing facilities if there is a need.
- Local healthcare facilities.
- Larger hospitals.

Latter- Local healthcare and education facilities should be provided in all major development. Details are better determined by the appropriate authorities, not by planning process.

Summary of Responses from key consultees:

Worcestershire County Council: Ensure good accessibility to healthcare facilities. Large scale developments should provide the opportunity for healthcare facilities: Would benefit from consideration of the importance of ‘the outdoors’, wildlife and countryside etc. on mental and physical health and wellbeing.

GOWM: No mention of healthcare provision.

WMRA: Emerging Regional Spatial Strategy Policy SR2 seeks the provision of necessary services and social infrastructure, including health, at settlements of significant development (Worcester in the context of the Joint Core Strategy) and in other areas where development is concentrated. In order to accord with Policy SR2 the locations identified for significant growth in Option 1 of Issue 30 should be the same as those described in Policy SR2.

Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):
Worcestershire Primary Care Trust: Provide new facilities in locations identified for significant growth, in partnership with social/healthcare organisations Strongly Agree.
• Increase capacity of existing primary healthcare resources in partnership with social/healthcare organisations **Strongly Agree.**
• In some other way: Capital alone is not the consideration- ongoing revenue support is essential.
Partnerships may also include some developers e.g. Housing Associations, RSLS, Leisure Providers.

**Outstanding issues:** Implications for growth of hospitals, Acute Trust and PCT estate strategies?

**Where the evidence is taking us:** Consideration to be given to incorporating this issue into Developer Contribution SPD, that will cover other related issues, e.g. public open space provision that indirectly promote health and wellbeing. Identify and cost necessary healthcare infrastructure through Implementation Plan.

### Issue 31: How can educational opportunities be improved for local people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire responses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1 Promote the role of the University, and Colleges of Further Education in South Worcestershire as centres of education excellence: Strongly Agree 60.8% Agree 35.9% Disagree 2.6% Strongly Disagree 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2 Seek contributions from developers towards improved facilities at primary, secondary, and sixth form colleges: Strongly Agree 39.4% Agree 43.2% Disagree 14.4% Strongly Disagree 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant agreement for Options 1 and Options 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Questionnaire comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Vocational training- increases range of subjects available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with business, support CBT, and support apprenticeships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage retention of village schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Take account of University with regards to infrastructure and housing accommodation and embrace opportunity to improve city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schools as community resource.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Responses from key consultees:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worcestershire County Council:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining school rolls (despite population increase). School rolls falling in rural areas some development in villages with school may be welcome. Financial contributions sought if insufficient school places based on 2.9 children per year group from 100 new dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOWM:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% of children do not do well in the school system. Need to consider how this will be addressed. Suggest consideration be given to support vocational training. <em>(Role of JCS in this requires clarification from GOWM)</em> Importance of schools, children centres, youth facilities at the heart of communities, and how these services and facilities can be key to cohesion and improved access to services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WMRA:</strong> no specific comments on this Issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General rural renaissance comment relating to need to improve the range and quality of rural services in accordance with the scale and nature of development and to facilitate appropriate mechanisms for the delivery of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses from key technical/other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Education Authority as above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outstanding issues:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How can the Joint Core Strategy address vocational training?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Should there be some development in villages to support schools?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• How should the Joint Core Strategy take account of the expansion of University of Worcester, in terms of infrastructure and housing and how does this link with Worcester city centre Masterplan?
• How should the Joint Core Strategy promote the role of further/higher education?

Where the evidence is taking us: Schools and other youth facilities, included in the range of facilities provided by developers to support development.

Issue 32: How can we reduce crime and fear of crime?

Summary of Questionnaire responses:
Option 1 Promote a range of uses in city and town centres to ensure 24-hour natural surveillance:
Strongly Agree 37.6% Agree 48.4% Disagree 11.9% Strongly Disagree 2%
Option 2 Promote the design and layout of buildings that discourages criminal activity:
Strongly Agree 46.2% Agree 51.3% Disagree 1.6% Strongly Disagree 0.9%
Option 3 Ensure existing recreation, sport and community facilities are not lost and they are enhanced where necessary:
Strongly Agree 54.8% Agree 42.5% Disagree 2% Strongly Disagree 0.8%

Significant overall support for all Options.

Summary of Questionnaire other comments or letters received:
- Questionnaire Comments:
  • Most prevalent comment was the need for a more visible police presence.
  • Greater provision of leisure/recreation, particularly for youth, as means of reducing opportunities for crime.
  • Improved lighting/public realm to ‘design-out’ crime.
  • Media to play a stronger/more responsible role in reducing fear of crime.

- Letter Summaries:
  • Need to be aware of cross-border crime, particularly along motorway network. Consider impact of development on neighbouring communities e.g. Tenbury Wells/Ludlow/ Craven Arms (Agent).
  • Need to be proactive urban and rural landscaping design, as well as access to open space/nature and social/cultural inclusion (Worcestershire County Council).
  • Walled off paths need to be more open and visible, therefore self-policing (The Inland Waterways Association).

Summary of Responses from key consultees:

- Worcestershire County Council: Close liaison with police during pre-planning stage to ‘design-out’ crime. Access to open space/nature and social/cultural inclusion to reduce opportunities for crime.
- GOWM: No comments.
- WMRA: No potential issues of general conformity.

Responses from key technical/ other statutory organisations (specific to issue raised, if any):
**West Mercia Constabulary:**

- For development to take place which can uphold sufficient levels of emergency service cover, it will be essential that road networks are constructed with the capacity to take planned traffic growth.
- Any development to west of Worcester would require major link/ring road and new bridge crossing to north of the city.
- In terms of locating new growth, the least favoured option by West Mercia Constabulary is the expansion of the existing village settlements and/or the development of a new town.

**Outstanding issues:** Various spatial overlaps involving crime section within range of Issues and Options Paper. Would be combined with ‘Stronger (and/or Safer) Communities’ theme?

**Where the evidence is taking us:** ‘Designing-out Crime’ could be tackled via individual SPD, promotion of social inclusion through improved developer contributions to recreational/community facilities.