

## Précis of SAP Village Questionnaires PART 2

Village: HANLEY SWAN	Part 2 Possible Sites																																											
<b>Summary of questionnaire responses:</b>																																												
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>SITE</th> <th>FOR COUNT</th> <th>AGAINST COUNT</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>MHHS01</td><td>0</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS02</td><td>0</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS03</td><td>3</td><td>11</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS04</td><td>0</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS05</td><td>0</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS06</td><td>0</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS07</td><td>2</td><td>10</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS08</td><td>0</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS09</td><td>0</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS10</td><td>3</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS11</td><td>1</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>MHHS12</td><td>0</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>All Sites</td><td>9</td><td>69</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	SITE	FOR COUNT	AGAINST COUNT	MHHS01	0	5	MHHS02	0	4	MHHS03	3	11	MHHS04	0	4	MHHS05	0	4	MHHS06	0	4	MHHS07	2	10	MHHS08	0	6	MHHS09	0	4	MHHS10	3	5	MHHS11	1	4	MHHS12	0	8	All Sites	9	69		
SITE	FOR COUNT	AGAINST COUNT																																										
MHHS01	0	5																																										
MHHS02	0	4																																										
MHHS03	3	11																																										
MHHS04	0	4																																										
MHHS05	0	4																																										
MHHS06	0	4																																										
MHHS07	2	10																																										
MHHS08	0	6																																										
MHHS09	0	4																																										
MHHS10	3	5																																										
MHHS11	1	4																																										
MHHS12	0	8																																										
All Sites	9	69																																										
<b>Summary of site MHHS01 comments:</b>																																												
<p><b>FOR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p><b>AGAINST</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not build on Fields</li> <li>• Enough houses already in the village. 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.</li> </ul>																																											
<b>Summary of site MHHS02 comments:</b>																																												
<p><b>FOR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p><b>AGAINST</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not build on Fields</li> <li>• Enough houses already in the village. 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.</li> </ul>																																											
<b>Summary of site MHHS03 comments:</b>																																												
<p><b>FOR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need affordable housing, and the housing association have done a lot of work and have made it their business to be open about their proposal</li> <li>• We need homes for retired couples/singles, this would free up family homes that often have only one person living in them.</li> </ul>	<p><b>AGAINST</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flooding risk It would spoil rural character of the village</li> <li>• Do not build on Fields</li> <li>• Enough houses already in the village. 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.</li> <li>• The village would not be able to</li> </ul>																																											

- The site would be suitable as an extension of the allocated land MHHS07 for housing.

sustain a large amount of new housing. There is nowhere for people to work. It would become a commuter village and ruin the present culture and identity of the area.

- This site has partly been approved for social housing. Between this development and settlement boundary is a 30m strip of land which the Inspector describes as "a sensitive location on account of both a hedgerow of landscape value running along its boundary with the appeal site, and proximity to back of dwellings alongside settlement boundary". He doubts the strip could be developed without detriment to the general character and landscape setting of the settlement".
- These sites are all outside the settlement boundary.
- Should not extend village towards Malvern and Three Counties showground - Too much development along that road. Church would become enclosed. Spoil the character of the village.

**Summary of site MHHS04 comments:**

<p><b>FOR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p><b>AGAINST</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not build on Fields</li> <li>• Enough houses already in the village. 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.</li> </ul>
---	---

**Summary of site MHHS05 comments:**

<p><b>FOR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<p><b>AGAINST</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not build on Fields</li> <li>• Enough houses already in the village. 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.</li> </ul>
---	---

**Summary of site MHHS06 comments:**

**FOR**

- 

**AGAINST**

- Do not build on Fields
- Enough houses already in the village. 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.

**Summary of site MHHS07 comments:**

**FOR**

- Limited use- not whole site and not all at once- 15 houses not 40
- Suitable because it is in the centre of the village, could be well designed to have houses for people of all ages with local facilities for them to go and be employed in

**AGAINST**

- Flooding risk It would spoil rural character of the village
- Do not build on Fields
- Enough houses already in the village. 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.
- there is no employment, would be a burden on services and schools and more traffic and increase carbon footprint.
- These sites are all outside the settlement boundary.

**Summary of site MHHS08 comments:**

**FOR**

- 

**AGAINST**

- Flooding risk It would spoil rural character of the village
- Do not build on Fields
- Enough houses already in the village. 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.

**Summary of site MHHS09 comments:**

**FOR**

- 

**AGAINST**

- Do not build on Fields
- Enough houses already in the village.
- 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.

**Summary of site MHHS10 comments:**

**FOR**

- Only part of the site should be used but it fits into the shape of the village. The site needs splitting. There would be little visual impact.

**AGAINST**

- Do not build on Fields
- Enough houses already in the village.
- 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.
- No suitable access for vehicles  
No footway along Picken End

**Summary of site MHHS11 comments:**

**FOR**

- 

**AGAINST**

- Do not build on Fields
- Enough houses already in the village.
- 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.

**Summary of site MHHS12 comments:**

**FOR**

- 

**AGAINST**

- Flooding risk It would spoil rural character of the village
- Do not build on Fields
- Enough houses already in the village.
- 33% of houses in the village are already affordable houses- a massive proportion. No more are needed.
- These sites are all outside the settlement boundary.

**Summary of suggested sites not identified through the SHLAA:**

- Incinerator Site
- Behind (west) of houses along Welland Road, Hanley Orchard, Westmere
- Gap in Roberts End - North side of the main road.