

Objections abbreviated to planning application W/24/00483/OUT

1. The site was previously considered for development and was turned down because it went against SWDP 2, SWDP21, and SWDP 25. It is impossible for us to quantify the impact on the existing village of such a large development. The previous attempt to build on a piece of land in this site was refused (W/23/00880/PIP) and went to appeal with the refusal being upheld.

All reasons to refuse the smaller site apply to this larger site and on a larger scale.

2. This proposal contravenes SWDP1, this is not a sustainable development, it does not meet the sustainable development principles. The site is too far away from the public transport networks for example Pershore train station is approximately 40 minute walk from the northernmost part of the site.

3. The site also is not in line with SWDP4, moving around south Worcestershire. There should be a travel plan document for major developments, to set out measures to reduce demand for travel by private car. The travel plan does not encourage measures to reduce private car use.

4. SWDP2 A part iv states that the plan should “Encourage the effective use and re-use of accessible, available and environmentally acceptable brownfield land.” This is currently farmland, next to the boundary for the proposed Throckmorton new town. This means any “open countryside” between the proposed new town and the existing village will be reduced to almost nothing.

5. This proposal contravenes SWDP 13: effective use of land. Part B states “Housing development in south Worcestershire will make the most effective and efficient use of land, with housing density designed to enhance the character and quality of the local area, commensurate with a viable scheme and infrastructure capacity.”

6. The proposal adds potential pressures to Owletts End, a road that has serious flooding issues which have not been resolved. Residents have struggled with access during heavy rainfall and adding a cycle way and pedestrian way will add to the pressure on this road.

7. Given that the developer is arguing that the council does not have a 5 year land supply, we have to consider the NPPF. When taking into account the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) please use the following to object to the planning application as the application does not comply with the following policies aspects of the NPPF: Chapter 9 sustainable transport (backed up by points 2 and 3 above, using our SWDP policies) This site is unsuitable given the location, lack of public transport, lack of proximity to jobs and educational facilities (including Further Education Colleges), and lack of access to meaningful active travel routes. Chapter 11 effective use of land also applies given this is a working farm.

8. We already have an orchard. We don't need another one! Adding another orchard to the village is not needed. Also adding a shop to the north of the village is unlikely to enhance the community. It will make our services disparate, with residents using the Co-op in north Pershore. The village hall and pub are in the centre of the village.

8. There are concerns in the village about capacity in the drainage system. This has been supported by the utility review for Throckmorton New Town which notes there is insufficient capacity at Allens Hill Sewage Pumping Station. While the Throckmorton New Town is considerably bigger, where is the evidence that the 185 homes will contribute to a flooding issue?

9. Finally the population of the parish is approximately 700 people with 380 homes. This proposal will add 50% to the population. The current increase of three housing estates since the first SWDP plan has added approximately 150 homes to the village already. Application of the 'tilted balance': The basis upon which the "tilted balance" had been applied refers to paragraph 11(d) ii of the NPPF that, where the presumption applies, planning permission should be granted unless there are "adverse impacts which would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits." This objection demonstrates there is an adverse impact on the parish. It should therefore be rejected.