

PLANNING APPLICATION 10/00228/OUT - LAND TO WEST OF WORCESTER

SUMMARY OF NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION NO. 1

PREAMBLE

This document provides a summary of 290 'neighbour' responses received on this planning application by 8th June 2010. The document has been prepared by the case officer, Vicky Bilton, who has read and summarised the comments into the broad categories as set out below.

It is important to recognise that the responses below simply represent the case officer's paraphrasing or a direct quote extracted from the comments that have been received. The aim of the document is to capture the essence of the comments succinctly. In no way does the document fully encapsulate the full content of all the comments received.

Any additional comments received that raise issues not covered in the comments below, may be subject to further summary.

Persons wishing to inspect the full comments set out in the 'neighbour' letters received on the planning application may do so. Copies of the letters summarised in this document are available for inspection either on the Council's website at www.malvern hills.gov.uk. Hard copies are also available for inspection upon request.

Principles of Overall Development

Objections in Principle:

The development will destroy the rural village communities.

There is a danger of villages such as Rushwick becoming commuter towns.

The number of people objecting greatly outnumber those in support.

Worcester is sustainable at it is. The development would risk its appeal

Development should be restricted to the east side of the City, where the major routes for the City are planned.

An unnecessary expansion that which will lead to destruction of local communities and cause traffic chaos.

An earlier expansion of Worcester (Warndon Villages) resulted in inward migration from the Birmingham conurbation and has resulted in substantial increase in commuting to MUAs.

There will be unforeseen consequences if an excessive housing demand for South Worcestershire results in an increase of the drain of skilled economically active people from the Birmingham conurbation to South Worcestershire as has already happened.

Will the new town be an attractive dormitory for commuters to London and other towns in the south of England, especially when the promised high speed trains are in operation?

If the proposed development is allowed, could a ghost town be created?

Development of such a scale simply does not work and would cause untold damage to our social fabric.

Please consider a reasonable growth of all Worcestershire as a way forward to meet the growth needs as they are identified.

I agree that we desperately need more housing but there are multiple sites available throughout the County without the need for destruction of established communities.

I propose you leave things as they are and concentrate on housing to suit the current population of the villages west of Worcester.

There is nothing sustainable about building 4000 new homes on green fields.

Comments on Development Approach:

The mixture of private and social homes on the site of the old Oakleigh Garage in Hallow was fine, and this, surely is how building in the future should be, small scale well designed and not totally altering the landscape.

Why built so many houses in one place?

Smaller developments spread around the county would be more acceptable.

It would be far better to build a lower number of homes across a larger number of villages.

If the Council is set on some development it might consider the building of smaller homes and sheltered accommodation for the elderly within the village, so they can continue to live in familiar surroundings and amongst the people they know.

Statistics show that in Malvern Hills, Wychavon, Wyre Forest and Worcester in 2009 there were a total of 5 941 empty properties. Why not use these properties?

Villages are part of English culture and should be left as such. Dispersing new houses in small numbers around every settlement in S.Worcs would solve this and retain the quintessential character of the English Villages.

A huge development such as this would be better spread across the whole area of Worcestershire

We do need some more affordable housing strategically placed in our village so that it will be an asset not an eyesore.

Agree that more accommodation is needed but question the overall need for the number of houses proposed, fewer homes positioned 'here and there' would be more appropriate.

Comments on Regional Spatial Strategy/South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy:

The Regional Spatial Strategy is no longer valid. The entertaining of any substantial application enacting the Strategy would be unsound.

I understand that with recent changes of government, there is no longer a plan to built vast numbers of houses in Worcestershire. This plan should therefore be abandoned.

The planning application is premature in relation to the progress of the Regional Spatial Strategy and South Worcestershire Joint Core Strategy.

Proposal should be rejected and the SWJCS should investigate the reduction in size of the housing and employment needs for South Worcestershire and identify sites that have better or existing infrastructure to meet the need determined.

Manifestly premature and should be rejected out of hand on this ground alone. Until the Regional Spatial Strategy is finally agreed it is impossible to check whether this application meets the requirements and criteria of that Strategy.

The original need for housing was based upon long term assumptions in economic growth and an influx of people in the area that are no longer true.

This application and the spatial strategy need a complete review and a more common sense approach taken...

Development is premature and speculative.

Whilst Worcester is a designated foci for growth the proposal to site a substantial community west of the river Severn is contrary to the Regional Spatial Strategy Phase 2 revision Preferred Option report by reason of the low current employment in west Worcester and the historical reluctance of employers to site a business on the wrong side of this substantial barrier to the movement of people and goods. We seriously question both the housing numbers and disposition currently set out for South Worcestershire. The number demanded is not supported by population growth evidence and questioned by the West Midlands Parliamentary committee. The prospect of any public funding necessary to support any development west of Worcester is low.

The Joint Core Strategy seems to have tacitly accepted this proposal and has identified two urban extension sites without as far as we know having conducted a full review of other potential sites or properly considering whether additional housing might be better provided in smaller clusters. The proposal is in response to a strategy imposed from outside the immediate area and does not reflect actual requirements of the locality predicted by up to date specific and detailed research.

The application is in response to imposed central government numbers and is not based on local housing need for west Worcestershire. West Worcestershire housing developments should be based on well evidenced local need

Need / Evidence Base:

The development is not needed for the local population growth or employment.

Development on this scale is totally unsuitable, where will the people come from?

How has the figure of 3950 dwellings been arrived at?

Need has not been proven for the proposed housing or employment land.

There is no need for local population growth.

There is no reason for the number of dwellings, there are empty homes in the area, notably in Diglis.

Need for 3950 homes is not proven.

We believe that migration figures have reduced to the city therefore is there enough evidence to support 3950 new homes?

Brownfield vs. Greenfield:

All land within the City should be used first before land within Malvern is used to accommodate the growth of the City.

A back door method for extending the City, within whose boundaries there are many green field and brown field sites that should be explored before crossing administrative boundaries.

There is much brownfield land in Worcester which should be used for commercial and residential development before green fields are destroyed.

Brownfield sites in Worcester should be development first before green field site.

The amount of habitable land on the earth is minimal so why not use brownfield land and ex industrial sites for housing or small developments of no more than 10 houses scattered over larger areas so the quality of people's lives can be maintained.

Other Issues on Matters of Principle

I do not subscribe to NIMBY attitude; no doubt 20 years ago there was a similar negative reaction by a minority of the community when the St Peter's development was proposed; now that has matured, it is generally seen as a positive development.

I own land less than two miles away that I cannot build on as it is in open countryside, if you allow this development, then you should allow me to build a home on my land, where incidentally, I work.

Comments on 'Housing' Issues

What types of houses are proposed? Larger family homes will put more pressure on services and infrastructure. Residents of such units are likely to be commuters and not work in local employment.

Demand for housing has fallen in the current economic climate. Houses in this area are unlikely to attract commuters.

We need more social housing but it seems little provision is being made for these in this development.

I believe that some new homes in our villages are needed but in much smaller numbers and for our local young people.

Can people afford to buy these homes?

The type of houses to be built will not address the issue of houses for first time buyers, only people already on the property ladder will be able to afford these properties.

I will concede that there is a need to increase low cost affordable housing in the UK. However this should be done in a considered way that encourages social mixing, say 50 new homes and / or sheltered housing in and around the village to encourage the growth of social responsibility and sense of being.

Adequate provision (a minimum 5%) should be made for housing for the elderly in close care communities.

Employment

Location:

Companies will not relocate to this area due to the remoteness of the land and congestion.

Employment development to the west side of the City is not attractive to employers, due to poor transport connections.

The west of Worcester is very unlikely to be attractive to employers, indeed industry has moved out of the Worcester area.

Without major transport infrastructure employers will not set up business in Worcester, west of the river Severn. We consider it essential that the fifth arm of the roundabout at the A44/A4400 junction be exclusively reserved for the NWOR.

There are no significant employment opportunities in the area, in the current economic climate no prospect of there being any. It would be irresponsible to permit a development which could lead to ten thousand people living in this area. This would clearly lead to a large increase in the volume of traffic, as workers would have to commute elsewhere.

The preferred options paper (SWJCS) admits that north-west of the City is “the location that is perceived to be least favourable at present for employment provision”. If premises were to be constructed as a speculative (like those in government advance factory schemes), we foresee that they would be white elephants.

The Developers are proposing to make area available within the development for employment – but this is not the same as actually being able to provide jobs. It is well established that employers have no interest in, locating to sites west of the river Severn, away from motorways.

There is no evidence to suggest that people living in these new houses will work locally.

Need:

Not enough employment in local area to warrant 9000 residents.

Commercial buildings are lying empty in Worcester. Employment in Broadheath will not equal the population increase.

There have been significant cutbacks in employment opportunities in Worcester over the last decade. The proposed development will add to unemployment numbers locally. Employment opportunities are non-existent for those seeking employment.

Allocation of 14 hectares of employment land is completely ‘pie in the sky’.

Where are the 7 000 or 8 000 adults that would live in the village find employment? Please tell me about the thousands of long term jobs that will be created as a result of this development.

What guarantee is there that sites earmarked on the plans for employment will attract business? There were no takers for the kays site on Bromyard Road.

Simple research shows that there are millions of square feet of commercial and shop premises vacant. Indeed as close as Hallow we have an office complex with many suites simply vacant. Neither shops or offices will create high value work nor are they capable of supporting a long term stable economy.

The adjacent city, Worcester, having lost its manufacturing base has become a dormitory town and will take some years to adjust to the uncontrolled population influx, created by the university. Approval of this application would exacerbate the problem.

Provision:

What guarantee is there that the employment land will be built?

This plan does not have enough employment potential to make the development sustainable.

Where will all the people work or is it considered that this development will actually be a dormitory town for commuters to Birmingham and elsewhere?

Size of Overall Development

The scale of the development is too large and will destroy the rural character of the surrounding villages.

This housing estate will overwhelm the village of Broadheath.

The size of the development would completely swamp the existing communities and destroy the nature of the area.

We consider that such a massive influx of people is just not sustainable as there are minimal employment opportunities at the present time for the current population.

The size of the development is unsustainable environmentally and excessive in size.

A town the size of Pershore forced upon the people of Lower Broadheath, will do nothing to help local families who would like their children and grandchildren to remain in the village to buy homes of their own. I do not see how the suburbanisation of Lower Broadheath fits within either the District or the County's policy of protecting Worcestershire Villages.

We are very concerned with the huge scale of this development; this will have a disastrous effect of making normal life for Lower Broadheath village residents impossible, with greatly increased traffic levels and the social problems this will inevitably bring.

ONS data demonstrates that the natural growth in population for South Worcestershire will require the building of approximately 12 400 houses for local people over the next 16 years – half that envisaged by the current RSS. There is no case for such a large number of houses to be built in this one location.

A development the size of Pershore would totally overwhelm Lower Broadheath

Character

It will destroy the individual characters of the two villages (Hallow/Lower Broadheath) by merging them and in turn making them part of a bigger Worcester.

We do not want another "Warndon Villages" on our doorstep which would sit out of place with our current delightful villages.

Badly thought through as it is on the west side of the River Severn.

It will destroy the village feel of Lower Broadheath.

Will engulf existing hamlets.

Will lead to the destruction of rural areas, fails to keep development within the City and retain the identity of rural communities.

Will destroy the character of the village. It will increase its size four or five times (Would it then be a town?)

A development such as this will inevitably lead to the extension of the Worcester City boundary.

The proposed development will bring closer the day when Lower Broadheath is joined to Worcester. As birthplace of England's finest composer, it is still inspiring to be able to hear skylarks and other birds on the very fields chosen for development. I would ask you to walk from the end of Oldbury Road on the footpath which runs right by The Birthplace and ask you to really question if such a development is needed in Malvern Districts Area.

Not in-keeping with the local area, in terms of density or height.

You must agree that countryside is more inspirational than concrete. Allow newcomers to be part of a community not cause of a conflict.

The rural atmosphere of a special village will be destroyed.

The 'new' would be effectively an expansion of the City, it should be regarded as such and the boundary changed.

Will completely destroy the life of the surrounding villages which will be swallowed up, not by a housing estate but by a new town.

This is the thin end of the wedge, there will be hardly any countryside left locally.

At present there are 700 houses in Lower Broadheath to propose a further 3950 is totally unreasonable.

Would overwhelm the existing areas of St Johns and Lower Broadheath.

This will be a new town and should therefore have its own identity and not be a part of Worcester it must be built further away.

The countryside and villages all add character to the City. There are numerous walks and areas of natural beauty that would be lost by extending the City and closing down the space between all of these areas of population. The east site of Worcester has already lost this character, it would be a shame to lose even more of Worcester's uniqueness.

One house builder means one barren landscape of Identikit Anytown housing or industrial units. The new town will be built to a standard set of four or five plans if we are lucky.

Our village has a great sense of community and it's a great place to live. This will all be killed off if the plans go ahead.

Location

The vast majority of people living on the western side of the river and the city travel to the eastern side for work, or beyond, this development would make this worse.

The railway stations are in the city centre or to the east. The proposed parkway station is to the south east – none of these is easily accessible from Lower Broadheath.

Why wreck the environment further when a road system already exists to the east of Worcester.

Land near to the M5 and around the Warndon/St Peters would be a much more sensible location.

Any new homes should be built on the east side of the Worcester, because the roads on the west side are already full of traffic.

The houses should be neared the motorway.

Transportation/ Transport Infrastructure

The proposed second bridge in the centre of Worcester will have no effect on the congestion that Worcester is notorious for.

History has shown that such massive developments attract residents from outside Worcester and hence consequential pressure on the transport system would be untenable.

Proposal will cause considerable congestion to Bromyard Road, Martley Road, Oldbury Road and St Johns Area, in a congestion managed area due to the University.

Proposal will cause considerable congestion on the A4440 bypass and A449 Bromwich/Malvern Road.

Proposal fails to provide adequate public transport. Reliance of park and ride would require a massive change in lifestyle. The residents of Rushwick will be subjected to increased car usage. Current level of traffic along A4440 is tremendously high. The development would result in 8000 more vehicles (potentially 16 000 more trips a day). This volume of traffic will result in gridlock.

Prior to any building taking place, the road infrastructure needs to be updated and improved to allow traffic to move freely.

There is no provision for construction traffic.

The junction link of the M5 has been identified as being too small to cope with the extra traffic.

The Wimpy estate at Monarch Drive was built with an ethos/contract for access to the countryside. This development contravenes this original ethos/contract.

The plans don't encourage public transport.

Query the basis of the evidence basis in the Transport Assessment.

The completion of a north-west orbital road appears to be on a wish list, but is unlikely to be affordable. The Highway improvements proposed by Bloor Homes are considered totally inadequate.

Those leaving the development by Martley Road exit will be trying to join Hallow Road, which is already a nightmare between 07:00 and 09:00 or use Hallow Lane to gain access to Holt Fleet Bridge to cross the river. Those leaving by Bromyard Road will only add to the already over congested A4440 route. Prior to any building taking place in this area, the road system infrastructure needs to be developed and improved to allow the traffic to move freely.

Martley Road traffic situation is already intolerable. Building more houses is madness. Lack of employment on the west side will mean that there will be pressure on the roads leading to Worcester. We believe the plan to extend the ring road is delayed for financing so this would add to traffic chaos.

Object on grounds of lack of infrastructure, particularly roads and the completion of the northern section of the Worcester outer ring road.

For residents of Crown East, the speed of traffic and poor visibility is already a problem we have to deal with on a daily basis. Understand the A44 is a substandard trunk road with a high traffic accident record.

Transport infrastructure is inadequate to deal with 10,000 or so people who would live in this area. New residents would need to travel to shops and work. With little provision for green alternatives this would significantly increase the traffic on current roads and lanes, leading to road traffic accidents, noise and air pollution.

Southern ring road is already trafficked beyond capacity, understand there is no prospect of funding to convert the southern ring road to dual carriageway or to build the northern extension to the ring road. Development will result in thousands more vehicles passing through St Johns, trying to negotiate Powick roundabout and access the City centre via Hylton Road and river bridge.

Potentially 6000 more motor vehicles travelling on roads that cannot cope even now.

Main artery (M5) and larger employers (and railway stations) are all other side of the river. It is naïve and stupid if planners believe bus and cycle routes will suffice. I am not against the houses but put the infrastructure in place first. If that means a new bridge across the river, then so be it. If planning for another bridge has to wait until the houses are built and it requires Government funding it will never happen and Worcester be even more grid locked than it is now.

It is essential that the extension of the orbital road is completed as a pre-condition before any housing planning application is considered.

Additional traffic would make living conditions for residents already subjected to a 'rat-run' across Broadheath common and into Hallow Lane and thence to Hallow intolerable.

Development will create traffic problems because of the extra 5000 or more people trying to cross the Severn at busy times (Or is a new bridge across the river and link road to be built?) Most people will commute, the ring road cannot cope with such an increase in population. The other routes serving the estate would also be inadequate.

Martley Road and Martley turning are over stretched, especially at peak times.

There is no prospect of funding to build either the northern extension to the ring road or to dual carriageway the southern ring road for many years to come. The Bloors development would result in thousands more cars passing through St Johns and trying to negotiate the Powick roundabout.

There is a serious infrastructure deficit in this area, this needs to be properly addressed now, before any significant increase in the population.

We think this proposal is impossible unless a link road and new river bridge is built first. Have the members of Malvern Hills District Council been to look at the area at peak times, and not just look at the plans.

Would increase accident risks in the already busy Bell Lane.

The northern link road would be a huge scar on the country side north of Hallow and Broadheath.

It is fanciful to assume that residents will be willing or able to use their cars on a limited basis only.

Development to the west side of the river is simply irresponsible given that the vast majority of traffic will require access to the M5 and hence direct access through the town centre.

The development would place an intolerable burden on Henwick Road and Hylton Road which are already congested with student parking and student motoring. The majority of properties in this area are Victorian – the fabric of the buildings themselves were not meant to take the excessive vibrations further traffic will cause to their foundations.

Before such a large scale housing development is given the go ahead to commence, it is vital that a new river bridge is built near hallow and a city ring road system is put in place.

If there must be such a large scale development then there must be vehicle access into Hallow village and a new bridge across the River Severn to complete the ring road around the City and on to the motorway to the north.

How would this new population commute to jobs? Worcester's rails are at capacity, a signalled upgrade isn't scheduled before 2020. The lines are not planned to be electrified and there are

no plans to expand the diesel fleet available to the UK. A dream of a new parkway is often floated Cross Country and Great Western have expressed no desire to stop there.

The Martley Road is a winding country road that is prone to flash flooding in a number of places, these events can cause chaos.

If you do not know Worcester, you should experience the length of time it can take to get from one side of the river from the other...Yesterday a journey (from Hospital to St Johns) that should have taken 20 minutes took over an hour and a half.

Something will have to be done for the safety of the children who live here (Lower Broadheath); motorists completely ignore the 30 mph limit.

The development should not be allowed before completion of the orbital road, duelling of Temeside Way and construction of flyover and the Ketch Island.

It is 'ridiculous and fanciful' to believe that motorway access would not be needed because of the idea of making local employment facilities.

Cycle way network should be provided.

Footpaths/Bridleways

What form will the enhancement to the public access network be?

There are four livery businesses in the village of Lower Broadheath. Please do not take away our bridleways away from us as it is our only safe riding area.

Community Infrastructure

General Provision

I am in favour if the development providing the associated road improvements and community amenities are incorporated.

There is far too little detail concerning the increased demand on hospitals, water supply, sewage, refuse collection, police, ambulance and public transport.

Where would the new population seek medical care from? Would we get a new surgery or dental practice, will our local health trust get additional funding for any of this. Will we have more police allocated to us, more firemen, libraries how will stump up for all the extra services a new town require?

Requires infrastructure improvements which are unaffordable and exceed that available in the local areas (hospitals, water, sewage, refuse).

Schools, local doctors, hospital are all at maximum capacity, where will all the newcomers go?

There is clear evidence that creating high density housing developments without the appropriate infrastructure will lead to an increase in social problems most notably crime. There are no clear plans on how to deal with this issue.

Green Space is vitally important to preserve the local character of Worcestershire, for recreational use and for health and quality of life.

Our concern would be that if there are not enough green areas for public recreational activities provided, there could well be potential for more problems with young people wandering around looking for something to do.

Where will these people shop?

Health

Not enough public services for such a population increase. The hospital will not be able to handle the increased resident numbers.

Health infrastructure is inadequate.

The population growth would overburden an already overstretched NHS.

There are no worked out plans for future healthcare provision. We seriously doubt the ability of the emergency services to provide a safe service to this village if the proposed development is allowed.

Our local hospitals will be unable to cope with the extra demands placed on it.

Doctors surgery will be needed. The two in St Johns would not be able to cope.

Education

Plans to include a high school and two primary schools are bound to affect provision for our local children. Once closed our village schools will never open again.

Replacing the Chantry High School with a combined larger school is madness in the extreme, The Chantry has an outstanding educational record.

Building new schools could also affect the catchment areas for our children; we already have a good school system which does not need to be changed.

The proposed building of three new schools could affect the current excellent education provision for local children.

The adjustment of educational catchment areas as a result of the development would not be welcomed by the community.

Lack of schools.

Schools are built during the last phase of development, where will all the children go until the schools are built, our schools will almost surely be overcrowded.

Lack of formal development plans for the excellent senior schools that already exist in St Johns, Martley and the variety of excellent early year schools around the villages

Refuse

The development will result in the creation of significantly more refuse.

Air Quality

Will reduce air quality in an air quality managed area.

Residents in the area will be subjected to increased levels of traffic exhaust emissions.

The development and consequent increase in traffic will increase noise levels and decrease air quality.

Tourism

Will put tourism at risk in the Malvern and Worcester areas.

Would despoil one of the main tourist attractions to the county of Worcestershire. (Elgars' Birthplace).

Loss of green fields will ruin countryside beloved by Sir Edward Elgar and could diminish the number of visitors to the Elgar Birthplace Museum.

Our countryside would be ruined which would effect the attraction of the Edward Elgar Museum.

Green Objectives/ Landscape Character

Is at odds with green objectives for the Worcester and Malvern areas.

The land is used by many walkers/dog walkers, the development would disfigure the land and impair the quality of life of residents and those who work in the area.

The landscape needs to be safeguarded.

Many important trees on the site, not subject to Tree Preservation Orders, if these trees are lost there will significant adverse impact on landscape character.

Will obliterate current hedgerows and wooded areas.

It is imperative that we and future generations are able to walk the ancient footpaths and enjoy the landscape.

The green/play areas do not appear to be very large, with this many houses it is important to include recreational areas for residents. The model in Dines Green should not be repeated, as there is nowhere for children to play. The play areas shown are all near bodies of water, I would not be comfortable knowing my children were being encouraged to play near these areas.

Light pollution from the new development will have a damaging effect on the local environment and wildlife.

This urban fringe acts as a sort of buffer which protects the much lovelier and more peaceful countryside immediately to the west – which would itself become the buffer if the proposal was agreed. There is insufficient infrastructure to support the proposed new town so there would be inevitable pressure to complete the orbital road. This would be immensely more damaging than even the proposed new town. Worcester is so fortunate to possess the wedge of woods, wetlands and meadows. It should be cherished. Instead of destroying it with a new road, every effort should be made to preserve and enhance it and to encourage people to access it more, on foot, bike or bus. They claim they will provide up to 10% of the energy supply for each phase from low or zero carbon technologies. Why only 10%.

Are you aware that local people have stories of the trees here that have certain histories like Cuckoo Corner, the history of which goes back 10000 years and dates to the original parish boundaries.

Wildlife

There will be a negative impact upon protected species and wildlife in general.

The proposal contravenes The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Habitat Regulations Act of 1994, in that Great Crested Newts are present and any development of this area would destroy them and their habitat.

Development will impact upon wildlife. The meadows overlooking Oldbury Farm have, for many years, been home to the skylark. This species will be lost by the local community as it will move elsewhere in search of a quieter habitat.

Will result in the destruction of countryside by the removal of habitats of small creatures, birds, insects, and in particular pollinating insects.

Details

There are no details of the types of dwellings... family dwellings will result in higher likelihood of multiple vehicle ownership.

The proposed buildings are in no way appealing. They have no character or redeeming features.

Housing designs should reflect rural character rather than urban character of the City, demonstrated in the Lower Broadheath Parish Plan and Village Design Statement.

Likely to lead to another bland housing estate.

Are you insisting on solar panel tiles, wind turbines and as many environmental saving products as possible?

The design includes buildings that have several stories and that are very close together. This is totally out of character with the local villages and rural development.

Any green field development should be an exemplar in terms of its sustainability – this development seems to be a fairly standard scheme and does not demonstrate the highest standards in innovative practice in building and settlement design.

The carbon footprint of the development is massive and cannot be justified.

Economic Climate

Economic Climate is aggressive, house builders have reduced their house building programme, this is unlikely to change any time soon.

In the current economic climate, the development is at risk of being a 'sink' estate. An unrealistic and unviable development at the current time.

Cutbacks in public services – where will the money come from to service the development. Worcester does not need this sort of development, it cannot cope with it and the nation cannot afford it in the current economic climate.

Our economy is not expected to grow substantially for many years, there will be insufficient employment in the region.

There are insufficient funds to repair road surfaces, pot holes and flooding. Our own problems need to be tackled first – not those of a further 3000+homes.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Existing utilities are stretched to breaking point and suffer from frequent outages. Water, sewage and electricity shortfalls are a cause for concern. The local pumping station is prone to breaking down.

Laugherne Brook is liable to extreme flooding. The development could destruct natural drainage capacity of the land. Surface water will have to go somewhere.

The proposal should not result in buildings in the flood plain.

Will Bromwich Road water treatment plant be able to cope with the increased dwellings?

Laugherne Brook is not adopted by the Environment Agency and therefore responsibility will remain with riparian land owners. His is not realistic.

Run off from so many houses would exacerbate an already existing flood problem.

Would result in major flooding on our street (Hawkwood Crescent).

The area earmarked for development slopes downwards on east-west line. Any development is likely to cause additional run-off water into the City, if it is built on, the Laugherne Brook will be put under further strain and the flooding of some properties south of Ambrose Farm and the area north of the 44 would be a threat.

Where will sewerage and storm water from the site go?

The creation of so much extra hard surfacing will make the problem of flooding far worse.

Once the estate is built it will be too late to find out that the measures are inadequate.

Will the development take Worcester or Malvern water?

Can the services cope with another 3500 homes?

Worcester has mainly combined sewers this proposal would overwhelm an already antiquated system.

Impact upon Residents

The proposed infrastructure improvements will unacceptably impact upon the living conditions for people living in Lower Broadheath and destroy the quiet enjoyment for which they are surely entitled to.

Loss of amenity in the destruction of the rural nature of the many public footpaths.

This development will impact on village life. Large estates have higher crime rates.

Traffic Noise - the path of the north – western by-pass is shown as cheek by jowl with housing 3- 5 storey high in the Oldbury hillside neighbour hood with no buffer zone, such as the one provided for part of the southern by-pass. Post 2026 – the unfortunate residents of these dwellings will be subjected to 24 hour traffic noise. This housing should be moved to north of the fishing lakes.

Impact upon Oldbury Grange will be very intrusive.

We are concerned that the development will bring more crime and social problems.

We could possible be subject to more noise and light pollution from the proposed sports pitches and industrial development.

Agricultural Land

The proposal will result in the loss of good quality and high yielding agricultural land and will result in the need for import of further cereal crops from abroad, which goes against the Government's desire to make the Country self sufficient.

There is a need for local food production; the development would result in the loss of important farmland.

At a time when the government is urging farmers to grow more this proposal would be against the current needs.

The loss of this land to the industry would contribute to the UK's food imports often freighted in by air. This seems to be at odds with the Government's insistence to save energy.

Outrageous that this should be allowed at a time when Government is urging farmers to grow more crops. It will be against all climate change proposals.

Good quality farmland...should not be sacrificed as a result of ill thought out and over centralised political pressure.

The proposed development will destroy for ever an important national reserve, namely good quality agricultural land.

Boundaries

If there is to be large scale development on the fringe of the City, there should be boundary changes to move the proposals into the City and preserve the village of Lower Broadheath.

The development would be close to but not part of the City.

The majority of the proposed properties are to be built on land outside the city boundary. How can this be allowed?

Planning Blight

The proposal will blight the surrounding rural villages, will there be compensation for loss of amenity and drop in property values.

Land Quality

We understand that under the topsoil lies fingers of glacial outwashed gravel. In parts of St Johns it has caused building settlement.

DOCUMENT END