

Précis of SAP Village Questionnaires PART 2

Village: TENBURY WELLS	Part 2 Possible Sites	
Summary of questionnaire responses:		
SITE	FOR COUNT	AGAINST COUNT
MHTW01	7	8
MHTW02	0	0
MHTW03	0	0
MHTW04	0	0
MHTW05	0	0
MHTW06	6	4
MHTW08	6	12
MHTW09	1	0
All Sites	20	24
Summary of site MHTW01 comments:		
<p>FOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • site is confirmed as being available, achievable, deliverable and sustainable in PPS terms. • Close to other developments • Another park/sports site needed this side of town to alleviate Burgage (and allow that for any future recreational etc development in town). MHTW01 traffic onto Oldwood Road hazardous? High School area so keep this site low key as to buildings. • Access, drainage and infrastructure problems. Existing features difficult to build on. Flooding (Bog Lane for a reason). • Relates best to the existing built form and the town centre. There are no obvious constraints to the development of the site and the visual impact will be minimal. 	<p>AGAINST</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of privacy to back gardens of houses in Berrington Road, Mount Orchard and Morningside. Lots of people local and tourism use public right of way. • Contributes to the local wildlife (especially local bird population) • On plan seems to provide natural infill.. Low density would be most appropriate. A strong structure of landscaped open space and tree planting would help maintain rural character of the site • Inadequate drainage - this area has already suffered from flooding - more development will make matters worse. • Landscape impact, poor access, remote from settlement. • Council already given provisional approval for development. Supposed to be Greenfield sites. Tenbury does not have the infrastructure to cater for this volume of housing. 	
General Comments:		
This site is part of a deeply incised valley on the outskirts of Tenbury Wells. Steeply sloping elevated ground with prominent local and long distance views		

to the north, including Cleehill. Development would be highly visually intrusive and perceived as building in open countryside. The landscape character of this area is Settled Farmlands with Pastoral Land use. It is in good condition with a high sensitivity to change. Development is contrary to the intrinsic settlement pattern.

Summary of site MHTW02 comments:

FOR

- No comments made

AGAINST

- No comments made

Summary of site MHTW03 comments:

FOR

- No comments made

AGAINST

- No comments made

Summary of site MHTW04 comments:

FOR

- No comments made

AGAINST

- No comments made

Summary of site MHTW05 comments:

FOR

- No comments made

AGAINST

- No comments made

Summary of site MHTW06 comments:

FOR

- Access, drainage and infrastructure problems. Flooding
- This is a simple extension to existing development.
- Houses would compliment existing dwellings
- Well contained and suitable for new housing assuming access is made from the adj cul-de-sac

AGAINST

- Inadequate drainage
- suffered from flooding
- I don't think this is suitable because I like the way I can explore the countryside. More houses would spoil the town.
- It is noted that the Councils SHLAA has assessed the site as being potentially developable, despite referring to visual prominence, a ransom strip held by the adjoining Jephson Housing Association development and lack of ownership details and confirmation of availability. The land has evidently been used for recreation with the adjoining secondary school. The site is evidently suitable for recreational use being maintained for this purpose. It is concluded that the site fails on suitability,

achievability, and availability as a deliverable housing proposal.

General Comments:

- Both of these sites are large Greenfield areas and further ecological information will be required. Although some form of development may be appropriate here an environmental justification will be needed. Given the location of the sites it seems likely that landscape GI and a 'soft' SUDS solution will be needed but it is not possible to be specific about exact requirements until further information is available.

Summary of site MHTW08 comments:

FOR

- The layout of the land and effect building would have on flooding.
- Access, drainage and infrastructure problems. Existing features difficult to build on. Flooding (Bog Lane for a reason).
- It will be very convenient for people to visit the town, and for children to attend the local high school.
- Assessments undertaken of the site (transport and landscape assessments). These assessments demonstrate the sites suitability, achievability, and availability as a deliverable housing proposal.
- The site is particularly sustainable being located close to local schools and within walking and cycling distance of the town centre.

AGAINST

- This land absorbs very large amounts of water from higher surrounding land.
- The Council has already given provisional approval. Water from this land already floods and causes damage to the sheltered homes this will inevitably result in even more flood damage.
- These are supposed to be Greenfield sites.
- Tenbury does not have the infrastructure to cater for this volume of housing.
- Landscape impact, poor access, remote from settlement. Poor topography.
- Prime agricultural grazing land
- Plans already exist for building houses on this plot.
- Prohibitive cost of drainage
- Infrastructure is inadequate
- Contributes to the local wildlife (especially local bird population)

General Comments:

- Both of these sites are large Greenfield areas and further ecological information will be required. Although some form of development may be appropriate here an environmental justification will be needed. Given the location of the sites it seems likely that landscape GI and a 'soft' SUDS solution will be needed but it is not possible to be specific about exact requirements until further information is available.
- This site is part of a deeply incised valley on the outskirts of Tenbury Wells. Steeply sloping elevated ground with prominent local and long distance views to the north, including Cleehill. Development would be highly visually intrusive and perceived as building in open countryside. The landscape character of this area is Settled Farmlands with Pastoral Land use. It is in good condition with a high sensitivity to change. Development is contrary to the intrinsic settlement pattern.

Summary of site MHTW09 comments:

FOR

- No comments made

AGAINST

- No comments made

Summary of other sites not identified through the SHLAA:

- Land to north of Berrington Road, no danger of flooding there. Land off the Rochford Road & land off whitehouse lane derelict farm buildings and unused land.
- The former Market Site.
- Trucroft, Oakleigh- MHTW09
- Small ribbon development along Oldwood Road might not exacerbate the situation unduly
- MHTW06 Well contained and suitable for new housing assuming access
- Rear of Greenhill Gardens
- Not in Tenbury
- Area between Saltbox Lane and the Bromoyard Road Industrial Park boundary to Kyre Brook 2- The old auction yard- people like to live within level walking distance of amenities 3- Land to rear of The Oaklands- link it to MHTW06 and put access to Oldwood Road
- If you have to build it should join onto Tenbury. Schools are full. No jobs.
- MHTW06 is far more appropriate
- Makes sense to focus allocation on MHTW01 rather than any other, for the reasons identified above. To the north of the town there are problems with flooding, to the east the land is wooded and steeply sloping.
- Land at Kyre Road, adjacent to Greenhill Springs should be included within the settlement boundary. Following the grant of planning permission for the former commercial premises at Greenhill Springs there will be a cluster of residential development outside but physically adjacent to the settlement boundary. The inclusion of this land would enable the settlement boundary to represent the physical and perceived edge of the settlement of Tenbury. As a consequence of the inclusion of the small section of land between the edge of the Godsons Close amenity area and the residential development site of Greenhill Springs would be included within the settlement boundary. This would enable the development of the site. The site is not with any landscape designation or area of planning policy restraint. The site is not within the floodplain and direct vehicular access can be achieved from the B4204.

Other Comments:

- Consideration needs to be given to correlation between housing and employment. Tenbury is not an expanding employment area.
- Run off water a major issue to consider, more building will mean more and quicker run off. Consideration should be given to a Topography of the proposed sites, water catchment area and how building and associated run off will effect the overall situation. Particular consideration need to be given to effective drainage systems.

- Poor pedestrian access along this road puts them at risk. It would destroy historic golf links. Social housing would create a ghetto of under-privilege and problems for other residents. Increase in town area would overwhelm infrastructure, justify a supermarket and lead to the ruination of independent traders.
- Use brownfield sites first.
- Recycling is adequate but could be so much our facility for full recycling is poor
- Infrastructure needs attention before planning considered.
- We would not need extra housing if people from outside area were not given local homes.
- There are plans for Shropshire to develop two large areas of land off the main road in Burford. If these plans go ahead you will effectively destroy Tenbury. Where would all these people work?
- Narrow roads, narrow bridge etc means that any significant increase in housing would put too much pressure onto these routes and they will become more dangerous.
- We can build sustainable, affordable housing if planning is relaxed, driving down the cost of building land which is too high. If we flood the market with affordable homes what will happen to the middle ground? Resources need to be directed to those that create employment.
- If its to draw businesses in then make the houses up market not like Council houses. It just makes the town look out of place. The schools would be under pressure.
- Build houses adjoining Tenbury, people can walk to the shops leaving their cars at home.

Précis of SAP Village Questionnaires PART 3

Village: TENBURY WELLS	Part 3 Possible Policy Areas	
Summary of responses:		
SITE	AGREE COUNT	DISAGREE COUNT
Q. 7a	30	1
Q. 7b	28	1
Q. 7c	28	2
Q. 7d	30	0
Q. 7e	28	1
Q. 7f	26	1
Q. 7g	26	1
Q. 7h	29	0
Q. 7i	23	7
Q. 7j	14	16
All responses	262	30
Summary of protection and provision of green space comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundamental importance - Willife must be protected. • Green areas are vital to ensure country life can exist. • Green spaces are essential to support sustainable development. The right mixture between development and retention of open space is essential. • Marking and enhancing the riverside to "levee" areas would be a welcome move. • Tenbury Wells seems to have surprisingly few areas protected in this way • The SAPDPD represents the only opportunity the District Council has to consider the appropriateness of existing Local Plan designated QL2 sites, along with an assessment of whether there is a need for any additional site designations. There are two principal reasons why it is imperative to re-consider these policy designations. First, for sites designated under Policy QL2, it will be necessary to re-evaluate their continued designation as part of the SAPDPD process, having regard to the need to find land for additional development in the current plan period to 2026. Secondly Policy QL2 sites were designated on the basis of the findings and recommendations contained in the 2004 Malvern Urban Greenspace Study (MUGS) and planning guidance which existed at that time and it must be recognised this was without the benefit of a PPG17 Audit of open space provision. • Without proper plans for what can and cannot be done in the area how can one make reasoned decisions on where to live, where to buy property etc. Even you wouldn't want to buy a house in the middle of the countryside and find within a year that you were about to live in a housing estate. 		

Summary of standards for open space and recreation comments:

- Allotments are essential. Cemeteries must also be considered.
- Developers need to make a profit. If developers are to make contributions to recreation facilities then evidence of this should manifest before development.
- Guidance for developers is insufficient. They must be told what they can and cannot do. Insist Civic society has some input.
- This is the case specifically for non strategic site allocations and future unallocated windfall developments (although it is recognised the latter should now come through as site allocations as a result of robust SHLAA strategies). However, it is not clear that if such standards are set in the SAPDPD how they will relate to the proposals established for strategic sites identified through the South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy. There is clear potential for overlap and the LDF process needs to provide clarity on this issue. The policies must also have regard to existing levels of provision in the assessment of the need for additional provision through new development.
- Recreation is so important and space must be provided.
- Requires more investment and organisation support from private and public sectors.
- Start with infrastructure never mind allotments and cemeteries. Doctors, dentists, traffic, necessary to town, schools etc.

Summary of protecting building of local interest comments:

- As long as they do not impose too many onerous and expensive restrictions on building owners
- Gutts School, The old Chapel Berrington Road, Regal complex, work house, Scout hut, Round Market all need refurbishment.
- Important buildings should be protected, maintained and used.
- Infirmary building on cattle market site is unlisted and at risk- the conservation is not monitored for unauthorised changes to building frontages.
- Where a group is of historic interest but not worthy of listing then the LPA can designate a formal conservation area. Local listings; have no statutory power although, as with any development proposal, if demolition is involved the decision maker must make an assessment on the impact on the character of the area.
- Many houses in Tenbury are historically important.
- Subject to objective assessment of merit.
- Teme Bridge, Temeside House, The regal and Community Building and protection of buildings in conservation areas. Would encourage tighter local authority rules through Article Direction 4 to ensure charges to buildings are granted approval. This it is argued would improve buildings within the Tenbury Conservation Area.
- Work needs to be done to enforce the laws associated with listed buildings

Summary of protection and promotion of shops and facilities comments:

- Any large supermarket would be the detriment of local traders and affect the viability and vibrancy of the town.
- Discourage shop owners leaving them empty. Tenbury Wells has good examples of this neglect
- If we don't look after the shopping frontages we will not see many visitors visiting our town.
- Improvements to free parking facilities.
- No Major Supermarket.
- More trade is required by all the shops- i.e.more houses are needed. No good to the existing businesses.
- Tenbury has recently won praise for the quantity of its shopping experience.
- Tenbury is a small town and all the shopping needs to be in one area.
- This is critical to the character and well being of the town. This should be delivered and financed by private and public sector organisations. Shops at the end of Cross St are not viable as shops and alternative uses should be sort. Where there are empty shops the District Council should encourage new uses.

Summary of a vibrant tourist economy comments:

- A caravan site on Little Palmers would be helpful
- Better facilities for visitors.
- But lack investment from District Council
- But not expanded near residential areas
- Charging for parking visitors and locals from visiting town centres.
- There should be flood protection for businesses.
- Opportunities for local employment
- This is very important. More needs to be done to develop Tenbury regarding tourism.
- Tourist centre in Ledbury does a very good job, but it needs information provided by local businesses.

Summary of protection and promotion of rural employment sites comments:

- And provide support for local industry
- Requires a better thought out and more flexible approach. Tenbury Business park is poorly located. However businesses in Tenbury could be encourage to relocate here allowing space for development within Tenbury.
- By allowing national developers to build on a large scale you will not improve the economy. If Planning laws are relaxed you will enable small local tradesmen to build and improve properties. The supply will then meet the demand.
- It seems strange that industrial units are sited in the wrong place at the other end of the town.
- Local jobs very important as it takes so long to get to other towns for employment.
- Small developments should be encouraged.

- Tenbury has a potential problem in that most commercial areas are located in Shropshire so are outside of the control of the main Council.
- This is an agricultural area, cattle.
- To take allowance of changing nature of employment - it needs to be a quality rather than area based assessment.

Summary of marinas, moorings and boating facilities comments:

- If you develop these sites, could also turn the centre of Tenbury into a marina every time it floods.
- Many people do not know the river well enough to mention certain areas for development.
- More use should be made of the frontage to the R. Teme
- No consideration has been given to maximising the river frontage alongside Temeside House.
- Not relevant/suitable for Tenbury

Summary of education, health and leisure comments:

- All leisure facilities need upgrading.
- Development can help sustain existing facilities and potentially also improve them.
- Merger of sports facilities - both wet/dry sports.
- No more schools; contain the kids and teach them properly
- No more selling off of school playing grounds
- Our local schools are already bursting at the seams so any housing must include increased educational facilities.
- Playing fields should not be sold off
- Provide funds to make it happen.
- Sports, community centres and health centres are all vital.

Summary of creation of vibrant City & Town centre comments

- '24' hr living not a major consideration. Regal cinema should be used more.
- 24 hr living only important in a large town or city.
- Increased housing will require significant increase to parking. 'Night time' economy needs careful handling to reduce yobbish behaviour.
- Night time economy and 24 hour living are not right for a rural town. It can lead to crime and make the town unsafe.
- 'Night time' encourages drunks
- No 24-living.
- No to supermarkets and high street stores. We need to keep the ethos of our town.
- Safety for users at night is important. 24 hour shopping in traditional town centres is questionable although should not be rejected out of hand.
- Tenbury does not require night-time economy and 24hour drinking and shopping.
- Tenbury must have programme for improving pavements and look of the town.
- The SAP DPD should consult the TBCS and TAP who have identified the several improvements to the public realm which would significantly improve the appearance of the town.

Summary of land for gypsies and travellers comments:

- Do not consider there is a demand and/or suitable sites
- Do not contribute to our developments in our area, and in most cases are not very good neighbours.
- Consultation with the Gypsy and Travelling community should be undertaken.
- If people choose to live within the tax system they should benefit from the facilities and rights.
- If proper facilities are provided and looked after travellers would be welcomed.
- Important sector of society yet unfortunately not well catered for.
- No permanent sites needed, unless they pay their dues.
- Prioritise use of previously developed land and locations.
- Tenbury doesn't have the infrastructure.
- The travelling community are not welcome. Extensive evidence shows that they attract or cause conflict and the level of crime goes up. The environmental impact can also be considerable.

Summary of local infrastructure comments:

- Better access to river frontage. Compulsory purchase auction-yard and develop it. Bring back the railway. Don't live in fear of flooding- accept it as nature and build accordingly.
- Better Hotel Facilities Central Hub Town Clerk Tourist Information CAB
- Better outdoor weather sports/facilities
- Better bus facilities & Local transport.
- Car park provision in busier periods of the year and the relocation of the Civic Amenity Site
- Desperately need transport for our young people to work Bromyard, Leominster, Hereford, Ludlow.
- Don't raise expectations unless you intend to do something.
- Downgrade weight capacity of bridge.
- Free Parking Not so many local buses are needed.
- Better local recycling, plastics etc.
- So any increase in housing needs to allow for significant increase in road structures it is only a commuter town really.
- Make the settlement sustainable and self sufficient and everything will follow.
- Pavement along Oldwood Road needs to be maintained more regularly to enable wheelchairs, buggies and school children to walk along safely. A crossing from Mount Orchard/Redgate would provide a safe crossing of the road.

Summary of other comments:

- Adequate car Parking Flood defences might protect town centre
- Affordable housing. Flood prevention.
- Bridge needs attention now.
- Compulsory purchase of vacant shops.
- Determine which county both Tenbury and burford should reside in (not both)
- Flood plain not accurate. More area was under water in 2007, than

shown.

- Lack of employment opportunities, any significant increase in housing would change its character completely.
- No more council-type houses Newnham Bridge has too many.
- Several small developments are better than one large one.
- Speed monitoring along Oldwood Road.
- Tenbury needs more houses. Make use of existing sites.
- The less building the better.
- To avoid building on greenfield sites give more consideration to windfall sites.
- Whatever decisions regarding planning of new homes, I feel that they should be within reach of schools and shops - Bromyard Road - Wheeler Orchard, but with tree and shrub planting.