Churchill and Blakedown Submission Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan

Consultation Statement

November 2016

WHAT WILL OUR VILLAGES BE LIKE IN 2025?

Want to have a say in how our villages develop over the next ten plus years?

Come and help start putting together the

CHURCHILL & BLAKEDOWN
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

on

WEDNESDAY 9TH OCTOBER 2013
at 7:30 pm at BLAKEDOWN SCHOOL

You’ll be able to learn more about what the Neighbourhood Plan can mean for Churchill and Blakedown, and can sign up to help with its development.

Do come along and join in – you’ll be made very welcome!
Map 1 Churchill with Blakedown Designated Neighbourhood Area

Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council (Licensee) License number

© Crown Copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100055940 Crown Copyright 2013 100018317
1.0 Introduction and Background

1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared in accordance with The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (SI No. 637) Part 5 Paragraph 15 (2) which defines a “consultation statement” as a document which –
(a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
(b) explains how they were consulted;
(c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted; and
(d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

1.2 Churchill and Blakedown Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared in response to the Localism Act 2011, which gives parish councils and other relevant bodies, new powers to prepare statutory Neighbourhood Development Plans to help guide development in their local areas. These powers give local people the opportunity to shape new development, as planning applications are determined in accordance with national planning policy and the local development plan (and any other material considerations) and neighbourhood plans form part of this planning policy framework. Other new powers include Community Right to Build Orders whereby local communities have the ability to grant planning permission for new buildings.

1.3 Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council applied to Wyre Forest District Council for Designation as a Neighbourhood Area on 6 December 2012 and the Designation was approved on 2 April 2013. The Designated Neighbourhood Area is shown on Map 1 Designated Neighbourhood Area above and has the same boundary as Churchill and Blakedown Parish.

1 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/637/contents/made
2.0 Informal Consultation and Early Draft Plan Development

2.1 From an early stage in the preparation of the Plan, the Parish Council through the steering group supported an approach to engage as many local people as possible in the plan process. The Neighbourhood Development Plan is built on a firm foundation of community engagement activity. A volunteer steering group of villagers was set up by the Parish Council to help in the development of the plan. The Neighbourhood Plan was first introduced to residents at a Parish Meeting in June 2013 and then presented again in October 2013 (see Appendix I), and work began on drawing up an outline plan in early 2014.

2.2 In April 2015 a one-page questionnaire asking for comments on the Plan Objectives was circulated to households through the Parish Distribution Network, with responses collected through boxes at the pubs, shop and Post Office, and also at the Annual Parish Meeting later in the month. Overall, the 24 replies were supportive of the Objectives and their intent – where comments were adverse they related predominantly to Objective 7 (Housing development), with concerns expressed that further development would detract from the rural nature of the villages. Many of the responses included positive suggestions for additional village amenities and for improvements to the villages and their environment.

2.3 The neighbourhood plan website (http://www.cnbndp.co.uk/) has been regularly updated throughout the process to help ensure residents and stakeholders have been kept informed of key stages in the plan’s preparation.

2.4 The results of the informal consultation process informed the development of the Draft Plan and the scope and extent of the Plan was revised to take account of public feedback throughout the two year period.

2.5 Appendix I provides further information about the promotion and publicity process.
Regulation 14 Consultation – Churchill and Blakedown Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan - 6 weeks from 1<sup>st</sup> November to 13<sup>th</sup> December 2015.

The public consultation on the Churchill and Blakedown Draft Neighbourhood Plan was carried out in accordance with The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (SI No. 637) Part 5 Pre-submission consultation and publicity, paragraph 14. This states that:

*Before submitting a plan proposal to the local planning authority, a qualifying body must—*

(a) publicise, in a manner that is likely to bring it to the attention of people who live, work or carry on business in the neighbourhood area

(i) details of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan;

(ii) details of where and when the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan may be inspected;

(iii) details of how to make representations; and

(iv) the date by which those representations must be received, being not less than 6 weeks from the date on which the draft proposal is first publicised;

(b) consult any consultation body referred to in paragraph 1 of Schedule 1 whose interests the qualifying body considers may be affected by the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan; and

(c) send a copy of the proposals for a neighbourhood development plan to the local planning authority.

Consultation on the Draft Churchill and Blakedown Neighbourhood Development Plan

The Draft Neighbourhood Plan was published for public consultation for 6 weeks from 1<sup>st</sup> November to 13<sup>th</sup> December 2015. The Draft Plan was available for viewing and downloading from the Neighbourhood Plan website [www.cnbdn.co.uk](http://www.cnbdn.co.uk). Hard copies of the Draft Plan were available for viewing in the following locations during normal opening hours:

- Crumbs (the Village Shop)
- The Swan
- The Old House at Home
- The Wagon and Horses
- Blakedown Primary School
- Blakedown Church
- Churchill Church
- The Parish Rooms
The Sports Pavilion

3.2 Hard copies were also available on request from parish Councillors or the Parish Clerk via email at churchillandblakedownclerk@gmail.com.

3.3 An email or letter was sent to the list of consultation bodies kindly provided by Wyre Forest District Council, together with a list of local groups and organisations. The list of consultation bodies / consultees is provided in Appendix II together with a copy of the email and letter.

3.4 Responses were invited in writing or by email. A Response Form (see Appendix II was prepared for submitting comments and this was available for downloading from the website or on request from the Parish Clerk. Consultees were invited to submit all written responses to the Parish Clerk: Mrs Angela Preece, Clerk to Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council, 24 Holmes Orchard, Alveley, Shropshire WV15 6NX Email: churchillandblakedownclerk@gmail.com.

3.5 All responses submitted in writing or by email were given careful consideration and have been used to inform the revised, Submission Draft Plan.
4.0 Summary of Consultation Responses to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan

4.1 Representations were submitted from 13 organisations and individuals. There were several representations submitted by local residents which were generally in support of the policies in the Draft Plan and provided notes and some suggestions for minor amendments which have generally been taken on board. Concerns from residents included the need for the Plan to address traffic issues and suggestions for strengthening text and policy relating to landscape, wildlife and heritage.

4.2 There were representations from several consultation bodies, namely:

- Natural England
- Historic England
- Worcestershire County Council
- Wyre Forest District Council.

4.3 Worcestershire County Council submitted comments relating to Policy CB2 and concerns around the need for the Plan to recognise that funding from developers requires a relationship between development and impact. There were also comments suggesting that Policy CB3 should consider pedestrian desire lines and that parking for schools is only acceptable for staff, visitors and disabled users. Wyre Forest District Council provided detailed comments in relation to Objective 7 and the need for a Sustainability Appraisal Report. Wyre Forest District Council also had concerns about the lack of definition of “small scale development” and a proposed restriction of housing to schemes 1-5 units. Replacement wording of “housing development that meets local needs” was suggested. There were various other detailed comments suggesting changes to Policies to bring the Plan into general conformity with strategic local planning policies.

4.4 Natural England were concerned that the Plan did not include references to Hurcott and Podmore Pools SSSI and that policies should refer to the need for development to have no negative impacts on the surrounding environment and particularly the SSSI. This has been taken on board in the revised Plan in several policies as suggested.

4.5 Historic England “commend the approaches taken in the Plan to ensuring that the design of new development contributes to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment”. The consultation body also suggested an amendment to Policy CB9 in relation to historic farmsteads and this has been taken on board.

4.5 Table 1 below sets out the responses submitted to the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, together with information about how these responses have been considered by the Parish Council and have informed the amendments to the Submission Neighbourhood Development Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Consultee Name</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Para. No.</th>
<th>Policy No.</th>
<th>Support / Object / Comment</th>
<th>Comments received</th>
<th>Parish Council Comments</th>
<th>Amendments to NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John T Lorton</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Support as a whole</td>
<td>Is Swan Pool, not Forge Pool// B'ham Road coloured green.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>Name changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brake Mill can not be seen</td>
<td>View states looking towards Brake Mill</td>
<td>No change, it is still looking in that direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picture 12 not to Belbroughton Road// to Sandy Lane and Hunters Lodge</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>Caption amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Picture 13 down towards Belbroughton Road// not Hunters Lodge</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>Caption amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is need for a bypass around the village</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Marilyn Hiscock</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Obj2</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Our first comment is that the Neighbourhood Plan does not acknowledge the presence of Hurcott and Podmore Pools Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) within the Neighbourhood Plan area. Despite the SSSI being away from the main villages any development or significant changes as part of the plan would need to take the SSSI into account.</td>
<td>Noted and agreed – we are anxious to protect Hurcott Pool from detriment by any development. However Podmore Pool is outside the Neighbourhood Plan Area</td>
<td>Additional Para is Section 1: 1.28 The Parish has a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) known as Hurcott Pool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8
<p>| S 4.2 | Policy CB6: General Design Principles. All new development should aim to ensure that there are no negative impacts on the and green spaces to a high standard. | Noted and accepted. Add description of Hurcott and in justification after 4.2.11. | Additional paragraphs inserted as follows. Subsequent paragraphs re-numbered. 4.2.12 The Parish contains a SSSI known as Hurcott Pool, the largest wetland area in the county. Hurcott (and the neighbouring Podmore) Pool was probably formed by mediaeval damming of the Hurcott Brook to provide water for industrial use. As well as open water there is a range of swamp, mire and wet woodland communities that have developed in the valley bottom. Peat deposition has occurred on the site and, although the hydrology has been adversely affected by groundwater abstraction, recent works have restored the water levels of the Pools so as to preserve and protect the flora and fauna of the area. 4.1.13 As well as the range of wetland communities, the site is important for birds and invertebrates. The wet alder woodland is the largest alder woodland in the West Midlands. 4.1.14 The Parish Council consider it is extremely important to ensure that that there are no negative impacts on the surrounding environment particularly the local SSSI. |
| CB6 | Section 4.2 Heritage and the Environment: we would like to see information here on Hurcott and Podmore Pools SSSI. See the description below to see how it is important to the local area. Hurcott and Podmore Pools were probably formed by mediaeval damming of the Hurcott Brook to provide water for industrial use. As well as open water there is a range of swamp, mire and wet woodland communities that have developed in the valley bottom. Peat deposition has occurred on the site, but the hydrology may have been adversely affected by groundwater abstraction. As well as the range of wetland communities, the site is important for birds and invertebrates. The wet alder woodland is the largest alder woodland in the West Midlands. There are already stresses on the SSSI and therefore it needs to be taken into account when planning any actions within the neighbourhood which may impact up on its notified features. | Noted and accepted | Additional criterion inserted in Policy CB6 as follows: (q) ensures that there are no negative impacts on the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>surrounding environment particularly the local SSSI. Policy CB7: Protecting and enhancing local landscape character and views. We support this policy and particularly part 7 of the policy in reference to Green Infrastructure. We support Action 7: The Parish Council will work with land owners and statutory bodies to ensure that the networks of pools and interconnecting streams run freely. We would like to see this action incorporate wording to ensure that this will be done sensitively in regards to any streams within or with link to the SSSI.</td>
<td>Noted and welcomed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CB17: New Local Employment Opportunities. All new development should aim to ensure that there are no negative impacts on the surrounding environment particularly the local SSSI.</td>
<td>Noted and accepted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lesley Brown</td>
<td>Obj 1</td>
<td>Parking on the road (illegally!) near the shop/PO is a serious issue. Affects safety of pedestrians crossing at the pelican crossing</td>
<td>Noted. This is an ongoing issue but not one that can be directly addressed by the NP</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obj 2</td>
<td>Yes, I think this is currently achieved, on the whole</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obj 3</td>
<td>Yes, although this doesn’t mean anti-change of any sort. We do need new housing and amenities but development needs to be sensitively, addressed bearing in mind we are rural not urban.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obj 4</td>
<td>Yes, I support this.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Obj | Martin Hobson | Vison and obj – S 2 & 3 | Churchill/Stakenbridge being the Historical aspect of the Parish, developed before the days of the railway and should remain Historically Rural in Nature. Blakedown, which has grown since mid 20's and even more so after the 1945 2nd World War Period developed through Govt. help via the K.R.D.C. and the construction of the then large Council Housing Estate to improve the housing structure for the local community population. This mean upgrading all the Rural Scattered Housing e.g. (from works cottages etc). From 1946 to 1966 some 128+125 from 1966-2000 were built and local families rehoused as time went on original families often rehoused for the elderly (Flats/Bungalows) and the growing families rehoused into those vacated by the ageing pensioners. In the last 20 years many have been sold on leaving a for those people requiring local housing within the community. This requires small scale development and “internal churn” where possible to keep a

| Noted | No change |
| 11 | 19(i) | strong community feeling that does exist in Blakedown. Blakedown to increase through small “in fills” where possible to protect the community spirit. Some of the report implies a community growth to feed Birmingham Boundaries and to Kidderminster, this has been resisted many times when and since my Father was the Rural District Councillor 1936-1974. Resist. 4/5 bed properties. We do not want ‘RIBBON DEVELOPMENT’ along either side the B4188 or the A456 Provision definitely for car parking at Station. Dr’s Surgery would this be sustainable Railway Station is important and regular bus service 7.30 to 18.30 6 days All forms of local heritage is important We do not require small cluster development No to more woodland GREEN BELT TO BE KEPT Palethorpes wood could be replaced with natural trees No more out of character building ‘SPORTS PAVILION’ Millennium Green is in perpetuity for children play Timber footbridge railway (private is this still useable) pg 51 No more planning such as Gladstone Place These are my thoughts on the Neighbourhood Plan, having lived in the Parish since 1940. Both villages need a certain amount of protection from the |
| 19(ii) | 19 (iii) | Noted |
| 19 (iv) | 19 (v) | Noted |
| 19 (vi) | 20 (vii) | Noted |
| 20 (viii) | 20 (ix) | Noted |
| S 4.54 | | No change |
| | | Noted, the Plan reflects this. |
| | | No change |
| | | No change |
| | | No change |
| | | No change |
| | | No change |
| | | No change |
| | | No change |
| | | No change |
| | | No change |
| | | Noted and welcomed |
| | | No change |
County and District Councils. The line of the Green Belt is of paramount importance and the PC must protect it from future development to satisfy the housing needs of either Kidderminster or the Birmingham boundary. Any future infilling must be controlled for local needs, NOT the wrong mix of housing such as Gladstone Place. Local needs must be considered. I realise Palethorpe’s Wood at the top of Belbroughton Road is in Broome Parish but any future development would encourage total Ribbon Development.

| 6 | Historic England | Support | Historic England are supportive of the content of the document, particularly its’ emphasis on local distinctiveness and the heritage assets of the Parish and the comprehensive approach taken to the conservation of historic landscapes and archaeological remains. We also highly commend the approaches taken in the Plan to ensuring that the design of new development contributes to the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. We do have one relatively minor comment that we hope will be helpful in more fully alerting developers to their responsibilities when dealing with historic farmsteads. That is, we recommend amending point 9 of Policy CB7 to read: “The conservation of traditional farm buildings through continued and appropriate new uses is supported. Proposals for redevelopment, alteration or |
|   | CB7              |        | Noted and welcomed | No change |
|   |                  |        | Noted and accepted | CB7 (9) amended to read as follows: The conservation of traditional farm buildings through continued and appropriate new uses is supported. Proposals for redevelopment, alteration or extension of historic farmsteads and agricultural buildings within the Parish should be sensitive to their distinctive character, materials and form. Due reference and consideration should be |
extension of historic farmsteads and agricultural buildings within the Parish should be sensitive to their distinctive character, materials and form. Due reference and consideration should be made to the Worcestershire Farmstead Assessment Framework”.  


We have no other substantive comment to make but in conclusion Historic England consider the Churchill and Blakedown Neighbourhood Plan to be a well-considered, concise and fit for purpose document that effectively embraces the ethos of “constructive conservation”

7 Worcestershire County Council

Recommendation: that these comments are taken into account during the production of the Churchill and Blakedown Neighbourhood Plan. Summary of Worcestershire County Council response:

In respect of the departments contributing to this advice, Worcestershire County Council officers have no objection to this emerging plan. The comments of contributing departments referred to below are intended to help improve the sustainability of the proposal and to direct the Parish Council towards best practice. Any departments not included within this

made to the Worcestershire Farmstead Assessment Framework.

With footnote:

response may choose to comment and/or object separately.
Location: Churchill and Blakedown
Proposal: Consultation on the Churchill and Blakedown emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

Thank you for consulting Worcestershire County Council on the Churchill and Blakedown Emerging Neighbourhood Plan. We do not object to the emerging plan and to assist the Parish Council in future stages of the process we would like to bring to their attention the following comments, strategic documents and designations. This response comprises officer only comments.

Highways
We would draw your attention to Policy CB2. Please note that funding can only be sought where there is a relationship between development impact. Without a strong link to the development these bullet points don't comply with S122 and S123 of the CIL regulations or the NPPF. There needs to be an understanding if the referred to junction have a poor accident history or this is just perception and if there a trend and consequential solution, a snap shot of incidents (from crashmap.co.uk) shows some incidents, but not large numbers. A more detailed assessment is needed to see if improvements are necessary or possible before this is included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CB2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noted. However residents in the villages have over a long period registered with the County Council their concerns about these junctions, the speed of traffic through them and the potential for more serious accidents than those which have arisen to date. We have been told that insufficient funds are available. However, it would be inappropriate not to mention these concerns in the Neighbourhood Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1.2 amended to read:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer contributions towards traffic management and highway improvements can only be sought where there is a direct relationship between proposed development and traffic impacts. However residents in the villages have identified the issues above and the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to address their concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CB 2 amended to read:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding from a range of sources, including developer contributions, will be sought. In response to the ongoing serious concerns of local residents, improved safety provisions at the Churchill Cross and Fiveways junctions;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Natasha Friend Principal Planner
Please note that Policy CB3 needs to also consider pedestrian desire lines as a result of this proposal. A desire line is the path that pedestrians are likely to take informally, rather than take the path/se route.

With regards to Policy CB14 Parking, the school is only acceptable to cater for staff needs, visitors and disabled users. Parent drop off is not acceptable and it encourages vehicle trips rather than sustainable alternatives.

Education We would draw your attention to Appendix C. Blakedown CE Primary has years reception to 6 (not 1 to 7 years) and will have a final capacity of 210 pupils following expansion. Please would you amend accordingly.

Concluding Remarks We hope that these comments prove useful in the future development of the Churchill and Blakedown Neighbourhood Plan and would offer the opportunity to discuss with the Parish Council any of these issues highlighted above. It is worth noting, once again, this response is officer only comments.

Given the size of the catchment area, the paucity of local transport and the volume of traffic on the A456, it is impractical not to acknowledge that parents will need to use private transport to deliver their children to school.

Noted and accepted

Noted with thanks

CB3 removed and additional bullet point included in CB2
- To provide commuter parking in the area around the station, so as to ease the increasing on-street parking and congestion

Additional point in CB6:
6. Improvements to footways which may emerge as ‘desire lines’ - preferred walking routes between village features.

No change

Appendix C amended to read:
School - reception to 6 and will have a final capacity of 210 pupils following expansion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mary Macdiarmid</td>
<td>P22 CB8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The Avenue is being used by vehicles which is churning up the path and is likely to causing damage to the roots of the trees along the path. The damage caused to the path makes it unusable to pedestrians during wet weather. Could this area be designated as pedestrian only and no vehicle access permitted after the properties near the car park who have their garage access on The Avenue. Noted. Additional point inserted in Policy CB8: informal pedestrian paths and shortcuts such as The Avenue will be protected to ensure that they continue to provide alternative passable pedestrian routes around the villages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brian Blakemore</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>I have 2 comments: 1. The Stakenbridge Lane/Churchill Cross junction is in my view very dangerous and a serious accident waiting to happen. I doubt traffic calming measures will make a difference. It needs a more radical rethink on the layout of the junction. 2. No mention was plan in the plan of the availability of good quality broadband. This is an essential nowadays to everyday life both personal and commercial. It is frustrating that Hagley is designated as a super fast broadband area when we are so close and have such low grade service. Should this be included in the plan? Noted. See Worcester County Council comment (7) with reference to CB2 and the subsequent amendment to the Draft Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Josh Grogan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Blakedown Community Park has recently had its playground refurbished. This serves children ages 3-10 years old. It’s also had a newly built sports pavilion this is used for ages 16+. I would respectfully request that consideration is given to building a skate park similar to the one in Hagley for the ages of 10-16 years as there is a gap for people in this age group. Noted and welcomed — it is important to provide leisure facilities for all sections of the population. Issue included in Section 4.3.1: Poor or negligible provision of activities and facilities for teenage residents. Play facilities and activities for pre-teens are centred around the school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This could be located in the area between the sports pavilion and the sheds used to store cricket powering equipment. I am 13 years old and there are little facilities for people in my age group. Blakedown has recently had new houses built and there is now an increase in young people. I would be grateful if you would consider my points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diana Edwards</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I think the plans are written in fairly general terms but with reference to most of the concerns such as parking, facilities and future building. I think there do seem to be outstanding issues for some residents to do with speeding traffic and parking in front of their homes, particularly because of the station. These do need to be addressed in any case ASAP, whatever the larger plans for the future. Thank you for your hard work.</th>
<th>Noted. Speeding traffic and parking on a highway are not issues formally addressed by the Neighbourhood Plan, but Objective 1 includes reference to these problems as a true reflection of resident concerns.</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs Owen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliance – we have struggled to find any reference to DDA compliance for any of the 7 objectives mentioned. Key to this is access to local facilities, transport and housing.</td>
<td>Noted. DDA compliance is interwoven in planning in general as it has legal status.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rebecca Brown Wyre Forest District Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for consulting the District Council on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. I enclose the Council’s formal response to the consultation which has been agreed by the Cabinet Member for Planning and Economic Regeneration. The comments are intended to support the Parish Council in making sure that the Plan submitted to the District Council for examination meets the Basic Conditions and is able to proceed to referendum.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective 7

I would therefore like to raise the following points of concern in terms of meeting the Basic Conditions. It is considered that the Plan Objectives generally comply with the NPPF with the exception of Objective 7 which should simply refer to developments to meet local needs. The Council is particularly concerned that paragraph 4.5.3 does not constitute robust technical evidence to support the policy of small scale developments only (1-5 dwellings) to meet local needs. The Parish Council should ensure that this is fully addressed in the publication plan.

Noted. However the Housing Needs Survey did not identify a need for other than small scale development to meet local needs. Para. 4.5.3 has been rewritten to provide the basis for this Objective.

Objective 7 amended to read:

Objective 7 – To support small-scale housing developments within the village boundaries that meet identified local needs.

Para 4.5.3. rewritten as follows:
The Churchill and Blakedown Housing Needs Survey carried out in 2015 drew a response from 32% of village residents (231 of the 233 returned questionnaires). 88% of respondents confirmed their intention to stay in the village for the next 5 to 10 years, and of those 19 respondents expressed a need to move residence within the village in that period. 7 respondents needed Affordable Housing accommodation within the next 2 years. This short term demand may be met by normal turnover within the existing stock. 10 current residents are seeking or need to move to owner occupied bungalows with a minimum of 2 bedrooms within the next 10 years. A further 16 respondents indicated that they would wish to move to owner occupied properties in the village within the next 10 years, mainly into 2, 3 or 4 bedroom properties. At any time there are at least between 5 and 10 properties across the size and price range advertised for sale in Churchill and Blakedown, and, apart from the demand for bungalows, it is expected that normal internal movement within the villages together with population turnover will meet the demand for
| Objective 7 | The District Council is also concerned about the lack of reference to Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which should be undertaken to inform policy development. The Council helped to produce a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report for the Churchill & Blakedown Neighbourhood Plan in April 2014 and it is not clear how this has been used to inform the technical evidence sections. An SA Report should now be published alongside the Neighbourhood Plan at the next stage. The District Council can provide further information on this if required.

The District Council fully supports the Parish Council’s commitment to the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. It is also recognised that the Council has a statutory duty to support the preparation of neighbourhood plans and at this stage that duty involves the Council providing comments on the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. These are intended to support the Parish Council in making sure that the Plan submitted to the District Council for examination meets the Basic Conditions and is able to proceed to referendum. Therefore, the responses set out below consider the Draft Plan against the Basic Conditions which are:

- Paragraphs 2.7 and 2.8 of the Draft Plan clearly set out the planning policy context.

Subsequent discussions (November 2016) with WFDC have determined that a Sustainability Appraisal is not required, given the lack of named development sites, and the expected low impact of any planned development under Objective 7. |

| | noted |
| | Noted |
within which it sits. They outline the NPPF provisions for Neighbourhood Planning and set out details of the local policies which are relevant. It is considered that the Plan Objectives generally comply with the NPPF with the exception of Objective 7 which should simply refer to developments to meet local needs.

Although the Objectives and Vision of the Draft Plan undoubtedly will contribute to Sustainable Development within the Parish, the District Council is concerned about the lack of reference to Sustainability Appraisal (SA), which should be undertaken to inform policy development. The Council helped to produce a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report in April 2014 and it is not clear how this has been used to inform the technical evidence sections. The SA Report set out the baseline information for Churchill and Blakedown Parish and provided an overview of the plans and policies that will influence the production of the Neighbourhood Plan. It also set out the current sustainability issues facing the Parish and the sustainability objectives which the Plan should strive to achieve. An SA Report should now be published alongside the Neighbourhood Plan at the next stage. The District Council can provide further information on this if required.

The District Council considers the strategic policies within the Local Plan to be those policies set out within the Adopted Core Strategy (December 2010) and those

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsequent discussions (November 2016) with WFDC have determined that a Sustainability Appraisal is not required, given the lack of named development sites, and the expected low impact of any planned development under Objective 7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above revision to Section 4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contained within Part A of the Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan (July 2013). It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan refers to these at Paragraph 2.9 and Appendix B. The Council is satisfied that whilst the Churchill and Blakedown Neighbourhood Plan seeks to provide a local approach to some specific issues, in general the plan is in conformity with the Strategic Policies of the Local Plan, with the exception of Paragraph 4.5.3. There is concern that this paragraph does not constitute robust technical evidence to support the policy of small scale developments only (1-5 dwellings) to meet local needs. Further clarification on wording should be sought from the District Council’s Strategic Housing Team.

Paragraph 4.5.7 should recognise the role that rural exceptions sites can play in local housing provision.

The Sustainability Appraisal Report will need to incorporate the requirements of the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive. It is not considered that the plan will have any significant adverse effect on a European Site. The Parish Council should consult Natural England on the SA Scoping Report who will provide more detailed guidance.

The brook does not form the eastern boundary of the parish.

<p>| 1.17 | Noted | Policy CB18 modified as follows: Proposals for new housing on Rural Exception sites outside the settlement boundary, will only be permitted in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and Wyre Forest Site Allocations DPD Policy SAL.DPL2 | Noted | Reference to the eastern boundary deleted |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Policy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Small scale housing developments is not defined – remove reference to “small scale” and replace with “housing developments that meet local needs.” To support housing development that is limited to 1-5 dwellings isn’t based on evidence to meet local needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB3</td>
<td>Would the Parish Council want to restrict the site to just parking or consider other proposals on their merit? Is the parking supported by Highways, landowner – is it realistic and deliverable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Action 2/3</td>
<td>Actions 2 and 3 appear to contradict each other; more control will lead to more signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Action 5</td>
<td>Action 5 – this is highly unlikely to be feasible (moving HGV route to the south so does not go along A456) The A456 is a strategic route to the motorway network which is the key to the economic wellbeing of the District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB6</td>
<td>A specific design principle within policy CB6 should be considered concerning the retention of surface water on development sites and encouraging the use of sustainable drainage systems. Given the presence of the Hurcott and Podmore Pools SSSI downstream, an important wetland complex, measures to treat water from any development sites before discharging it into the brook system are important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Section 4.5 Housing has been extensively rewritten to include more information from the Housing Needs Survey 2015, and to evidence the need for small scale development to meet local needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Remove CB3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted and not accepted, more control through traffic calming does not necessarily lead to more signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Not accepted. This is a Parish Action and not a planning policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted and accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 4.5 Housing rewritten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CB3 removed, additional point included in CB2 as follows: To provide commuter parking in the area around the station, so as to ease the increasing on-street parking and congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy CB6 amended as follows: (q) ensures that there are no negative impacts on the surrounding environment particularly the local SSSI. (r) encourages the use of Sustainable Drainage systems, and retaining surface water on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action 7</td>
<td>CB7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Sustainable materials, this needs clearer definition, practicality of implementation, viability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – Concerned that this is overly restrictive, where is the evidence to back this up? Evidence will be required at examination to ensure a robust policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Reedbeds for sewerage treatment is given as an example of sustainable construction. As sewerage treatment is not mentioned elsewhere in the plan it should be clarified that where possible connection to the public sewer system would be the preferred option, with non-mains sewerage systems like sewerage treatment plants only being acceptable where this is not possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A map of the watercourse system in the parish could perhaps be included, which section of the brook is classed as a main river for which the Environment Agency has an overseeing and enforcement role (this is the section coming from Hagley, discharging through Hurcott Pools) and which sections (tributaries) are classed as ordinary watercourses for which the County Council has an overseeing and enforcement role, which has been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted. NP has to take account of emerging policy, not be in general conformity. No policy has emerged as yet. The Parish Council consider it an important feature of the area to retain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reference to sustainable materials in section 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted. Remove reference to 1 – 5 dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted. Remove reference to reed beds for sewerage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted and accepted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference removed in CB7 bullet 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference removed in CB7 bullet 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map included at Map 5, although responsibilities not yet identified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CB8 | delegated to the District Council.  
Maps 4 and 5 need to be clearly labelled with a key. Only 3 of the 4 locations are shown on the map so the other will also need to be shown. | Noted. 4th site is on a separate map. Will address this |
| CB9 | Water quality aspects should be included in CB9, recognising the sensitive and important water dependable habitats downstream (See comments CB6). | Noted and Accepted |
| CB11 | This requires further clarification as it is rather confusing at present. | Noted, not accepted, however amend policy |
| CB12 | There is no mention of County parking standards, the requirements need to be tied to them. | Noted and amended |

Additional sentence added to Policy CB9:  
All new development should aim to ensure that there are no negative impacts on the surrounding environment particularly the local SSSI.  
Policy CB11 amended as follows  
There will be a presumption in favour of the protection of existing community facilities.  
only removed from second sentence  
In the case of the change of use of existing community facilities at Appendix C to other non health, education of community type uses will not be permitted unless the applicant can demonstrate the following  
First bullet amended of CB12 to read:  
Adequate provision for parking is provided in accordance with the Worcestershire County Council Parking Standards.  
Insert footnote with link http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/
| CB13 | This policy is not required as broadband is permitted development. | Noted and not accepted. This policy is in a made neighbourhood plan within Wyre Forest. Not all development associated is permitted development |
| CB16 | What criteria will applicants need to demonstrate that the site is no longer suitable for employment use? Concerned over the general conformity with the Local Plan Core Strategy policy CP08: A Diverse Local Economy. | Noted. |
| CB17 | Should be CB18. There are two CB17. The maximum of 5 units is too restrictive, if sites come forward which can accommodate more dwellings they will be sub-divided leading to piecemeal and often poor quality development. It would also mean that the threshold for affordable housing provision is never reached. | Noted. Reference to a maximum of 5 units removed, but description as small scale retained |

**CB16 bullet 2 amended to read:**

The continued use of the buildings, or their redevelopment for an employment use, is not viable (in physical, operational or commercial terms) and this is supported by robust evidence, such as the marketing of the site and evidence that the site is unviable to be developed for employment use.

*Renumbered*

**Section 4.5 Housing rewritten**

The plan states that housing need will be provided by the churn in the market but there is currently no evidence to support this and so it needs to demonstrate how local need will be met or why it can’t for example a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) type
exercise. District Council Officers can provide further information on the methodology.

In the 2015 Churchill and Blakedown housing needs survey the findings state that there is a need for an additional 7 affordable and 18 open market units of accommodation. Recommendations have been made that the parish council wait for the findings of the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs to see if it substantiates the claim that market turnover will meet need.

Evidence is required to support the 25dph density restriction.

Parking should be cross referenced back to County parking standards.

Need to consider brownfield (previously developed sites) within the Green Belt, national policy has an allowance for development of such sites even where they are outside of the settlement boundary.

Permitted Development rights allow conversion of many buildings to residential.

It is important that any new development will not negatively impact upon the watercourse system, with any discharge into the system from any development.

The Objectively Assessed Housing Needs report will not be available in time to include in the report if the NP process is to be submitted in time for a referendum in 2016.

Noted. Description changed

Noted.

Agreed
Not addressed by the NP will be assessed against Wyre Forest policies.

Agree. Policy comes into play where permission is required.

Noted and accepted
This is included in CB6 design policy

Section 4.5 Housing rewritten

CB18 amended to read:
The development is in proportion with the surrounding area and does not adversely affect the neighbours’ enjoyment of their homes and gardens

CB12 amended – see above

CB18 rewritten.

No change

Covered by amendments to CB6 and CB9
| CB18 | site being appropriately attenuated (to pre-development levels to not increase flood risk) and sufficiently treated (to prevent pollution).

CB18 should be CB19
Legally it is almost impossible to reserve market housing for people with a local connection it relies on goodwill from developers.

The requirement for a mix of tenures, types and sizes on sites of 3 dwellings or more needs to be carefully considered. It would be difficult to provide affordable housing as Registered Providers generally do not want isolated properties. The requirement for affordable housing does not kick in until 6 units so it would not be possible to secure affordable housing contributions on sites of 3 unless they were exception sites.

On sites of 1 or 2 dwellings it would be very difficult to monitor the overprovision of a particular type of dwelling and use that to support a refusal.

The last paragraph would not really be effective on sites of up to 5 dwellings. | Noted and accepted | Policy CB19 amended as follows

Within the settlement boundary as defined in the Wyre Forest Site Allocations and Policies Local Plan, small-scale affordable / market housing development that meets local needs and is in keeping with the scale, demands and population profile will be permitted where:
Appendix I

Early Promotion and Engagement Activity

Presentation to Parish Meeting, June 2013

Neighbourhood Planning
Churchill and Blakedown
Parish Council Meeting
19th June 2013

Where are we...
• First stage complete - Neighbourhood Plan area designated

What other stages are there...
• Evidence gathering (surveys/sustainability appraisal etc)
• Drafting the plan
• Consultation on the draft plan
• Revision of the plan following consultation
• Submission of the plan – to Wyre Forest District Council
• Examination
• Referendum
• Adoption

So, now the area has been designated, where do we go from here...

Is entirely up to you.

There are formal stages and legal requirements that need to be met to satisfy the regulations but outside of this there remains flexibility on how to proceed.

This enables you to decide what approach you want to take and tailor this to your local circumstances

Some initial suggestions to ‘get the ball rolling’...

• Setting up a steering group;
• Should look for a wide representation but numbers should be manageable;
• Needs strong leadership and drive to maintain momentum;
• Maybe consider having ‘sub-groups’ to look at particular topics? (Housing, Environment, Transport etc);
• Producing a project plan – clear strategy in order to meet the various milestones;
• Drafting a timetable – need to be realistic about how long plans take to produce (Example on following slide);
• Start thinking about key priorities;
• Think about how you are going to engage the community and get them to take ownership of the plan;
• Take the opportunity to learn from others.

Draft Timetable...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Opportunities...

One of the key questions asked by community groups relates to the financial support that is available for undertaking plans.

There are funding opportunities currently available and more information is available here:

http://mycommunitytrust.org.uk/neighbourhood-planning/apply/

Communities who are preparing neighbourhood plans can apply for both direct support and grants of between £500 and £7,000 for specific elements of their neighbourhood planning projects.

Again, this may need further consideration by the Steering Group once established.
Important points to remember...

- This is a community plan and it therefore needs community involvement and support;
- There are formal processes which need to be adhered to and the plan will need to be in conformity with national and local planning policies;
- However, this is a great opportunity to produce a statutory plan that is community led and reflects your aspirations for the future development of the area;
- The District Council are here to support/advice the best we can but the focus is on you and the wider community to take ownership and decide on the best approach to suit your needs;
- Finally, take advantage of the fact that there are many other community groups producing plans. There is an opportunity to learn from them (Good and Bad) and more and more guidance is emerging to help you (and me!) along the way.

Useful Links...

Planning Advisory Service (PAS)
http://www.pas.gov.uk/pasuk/page.do?pageid=1089058

Forum for Neighbourhood Planning:
http://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/home

Information available on the District Council’s website:

Over time it would be useful to consider a dedicated Neighbourhood Plan website/page on the existing Parish Council website

More general advice, but does include a section on Neighbourhood Planning:
http://mycommunityrights.org.uk/my-community-rights/

Contacts...

Jonathan Elmer
Principal Planning Policy Officer
Wyre Forest District Council
01562 732552
Jonathan.Elmer@wyreforestdc.gov.uk

Can also seek advice from other colleagues as and when appropriate:
- Development Control;
- Conservation;
- Highways;
- Water Management;
- Housing

Useful Links cont...

Links to the ‘Runners’:

Exeter St James:
http://exeterstjamesforum.org/home

Upper Eden:
http://upa.org.uk/

Local Examples:

Chaddesley Corbett:
http://www.chaddesleyplan.org.uk/index.html

Much Wenlock:
http://www.muchwenlockplan.org/

Community Infrastructure Levy

Any Questions?!
WHAT WILL OUR VILLAGES BE LIKE IN 2025?

Want to have a say in how our villages develop over the next ten plus years?

Come and help start putting together the

CHURCHILL & BLAKEDOWN
NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

on
WEDNESDAY 9TH OCTOBER 2013
at 7:30 pm at BLAKEDOWN SCHOOL

You’ll be able to learn more about what the Neighbourhood Plan can mean for Churchill and Blakedown, and can sign up to help with its development.

Do come along and join in – you’ll be made very welcome!

A few years ago, residents of Churchill and Blakedown got together to produce a plan for development of the villages – our ‘Parish Plan’. The 2011 Localism Act provides the opportunity to take this a step further and gives people the option to have more say in the planning process by developing a ‘NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN’, which has legal status. Churchill and Blakedown have now been designated a ‘neighbourhood’, and over the next nine months or so the Parish Council will take responsibility for pulling a Neighbourhood Plan for the villages together – which will then be put to the vote in a village referendum.

The Plan will be developed with the residents, for the residents, both current and future, and we’ll have some help in formulating our ideas from Wyre Forest District Council. The Plan will be about the development and maintenance of the community, its services and facilities. We want to involve as many residents as possible in defining how we want the villages to develop, and in working together on issues affecting Housing, Traffic, Heritage and Community – and any other topics which people think are important to the villages.

We look forward to seeing you on the 9th October. If you can’t make it, but would still like to be part of the project, just contact anyone on the Parish Council (Pete Dearden, Sallyann Cartwright, Sue Fowler, Pauline Hayward, Brett Humble, Ray Keys, Jim Long, Brian Pitt, and Roger Shade).
Meeting Agenda

- Introduction to the Plan
- Neighbourhood Planning
  Maria Dunn – Senior Forward Planning Officer for Wyre Forest DC
- Discussion, ideas, and questions

Planning Policy Framework

- National Planning Policy Framework: set by Government, addresses infrastructure, economic and housing issues
- Wyre Forest District Local Development Framework
  Adopted Core Strategy – December 2010: reflects the National Policy Framework
- Site Allocation and Policies Local Plan – July 2013: applies the Core Strategy
- Churchill and Blakedown Neighbourhood Plan - starts here!
What's the Plan about?

Our Vision of what we want the villages to be.

- A strong community?
- A place to make friends?
- A rural village?
- A place to grow old?
- A place with a sense of history?
- A commuter village?
- Somewhere people want to live?
- The outskirts of Knutsford?

Work Groups

Traffic, transport and communications

Possible topics for discussion:
- Speed restrictions — their application
- Widing areas
- Train services
- Parking — short term and long term
- Bus services
- Traffic lights
- Road crossings
- Traffic volumes

Community

Possible topics for discussion:
- Village facilities — social, economic...
- Village organisations
- Community networks
- Community support

Work Groups

Development

Possible topics for discussion:
- Green belt areas
- Housing priorities
- Business and commerce
- Building densities
- Environmental impact
- Population predictions

Heritage

Possible topics for discussion:
- Local List
- Local History Society work
- Preservation of the countryside
### March 2015, Village Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: To create a safe community for our residents and visitors; giving particular attention to traffic management and parking</th>
<th>Objective 2: To create a sustainable environment, with emphasis on maintaining the ancient tree scape, paths and green spaces to a high standard</th>
<th>Objective 3: To protect the historic centres of the villages, discouraging inappropriate urban style development within these essentially rural villages</th>
<th>Objective 4: To preserve and improve local facilities to serve the needs of our residents and for future generations to enjoy</th>
<th>Objective 5: To increase local access to health and wellbeing services</th>
<th>Objective 6: To support existing and new local business opportunities, in particular home working and rural enterprises appropriate to the rural area</th>
<th>Objective 7: To support small scale housing developments that meet local needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - better bus service arrangements for accessing doctor and chemist</td>
<td>Yes, see above</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Travel along the A456 is becoming more and more congested with the increase in housing development in Blakedown and in Hagley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree - Belbroughton Road needs speed calming measures. Traffic accelerates up as well as down this top stretch. There are not enough warning signs as approach village on downhill slope. Need rumble strips, &quot;20 is plenty&quot; zone, metre countdown as enter residential stretch</td>
<td>Totally support</td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
<td>Agree wholeheartedly. Like to see outdoor adult gym equipment in playground</td>
<td>Agree with objective 4. Essential to maintain shop and post office</td>
<td>Yes, agree. Improve broadband speed and strength and reliability</td>
<td>Yes but only if a) in sympathetic style, not like the modern development on Belbroughton Rd and b) the impact of extra traffic (two cars minimum per family) is assessed and managed to benefit of existing residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes please. &quot;Residents parking only&quot; signs to be erected outside flats in Mill Lane. I live in flat and cannot park nor have visitors. Train users take up road. We need this space to park as no drive. Train users even park here overnight and at weekends!</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No. Blakedown is a village, we don't want it to become a town!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The small island opposite the school on A456 makes the road too narrow for lorries and therefore a danger to pedestrians. A solution to the old problem of train parking in Station Drive.</td>
<td>Yes we agree. Make sure the prevention orders are adhered to. Also stop buildings on small pockets of land within the village, causing the village to become a congestion of dwellings and ruining the rural aspect.</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes. Would like to see public transport to local hospitals improved.</td>
<td>Yes up to the point when local businesses encroach on the lives of local residents and their way of life. Such as car mechanics working on drives or large commercial vehicles parked outside houses.</td>
<td>Again up to a point when Blakedown stops being a village and takes on the appearance of a small town with no open areas to enhance the area. Building design should always reflect the locality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes. Tidy up verges and footpath between The Swan and Churchill Lane</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>OK as it is</td>
<td>Yes - and schools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - agree would like to see measures in place to reduce speeding on Belbroughton Road</td>
<td>Yes - absolutely</td>
<td>Yes - would be a shame to destroy</td>
<td>Yes - agree - can't think of any improvements to Blakedown</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Yes, I agree as long as in keeping with the village and if it would help local residents to provide a service.</td>
<td>Yes, if in keeping with the village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - designated woodland walks and signposts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - whilst supporting existing local businesses</td>
<td>Yes - providing they are within the village rural look and not affecting green space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yes we agree. Suggestions/Plea! Enforce speed limit in Belbroughton Road (the 'race track'!!) stop parking on footpaths in B.R. also. To repeat one point from above - STOP CARS PARKING ON FOOTPATHS in Belbroughton Road - you cannot walk down the road at times without stepping into the actual road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>In principle yes, but must not stifle progress?</th>
<th>Yes. Could really do with a local (village based) Doctor's Surgery</th>
<th>See above</th>
<th>Only restriction should really be on 'scale' and traffic generation. Belbroughton Road currently has an incredible number of HGVs. Why?</th>
<th>Yes and not just low cost / social housing. Why not a small development of bungalows for the more mature residents, this would also free up some more larger houses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Desperately need a bypass</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - Post Office must stay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>To a degree, but would not like to see industrial or business park. We are rural</td>
<td>No. Lack of take-up on Gladstone suggests not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking on the footpaths around Blakedown. Parking near the school B'ham Road (0800-0900,0300-0630pm which has yellow lines)</td>
<td>Yes, but why was 15 trees cut down in the church?</td>
<td>No there is now no housing for the young people of the village</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is now only one shop left in the village. That opens 7 days</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Double yellow lines on Station Drive near the junction with the A456 and parking on one side of the road only. Resident only permits on Mill Lane and Sculthorpe Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes. As long as it is not destrucive to rural aspect of village life.</td>
<td>Yes. Decent size bungalows a priority please. 2/3 beds for private sector downsizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes - better safety at Churchill monument cross roads</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>More services at Kidderminster Hospital</td>
<td>No inappropriate items like the 'Co-Op' scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Yes, restrictions of corporate change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - keep our heritage</td>
<td>Yes - maintain the heritage of the village</td>
<td>It's already very good</td>
<td>Local business is the generator that keeps the village working - corporate business will only employ cheap labour.</td>
<td>No - starter homes are not needed on Blakedown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow lines on n/s at the station to stop obstructing the road. Only parking on station side.</td>
<td>Stop vehicles parking on verges and ruining grass edges as this ruins the grass and obstructs the pavement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Proposed Co-Op scheme is not viable as there would be no provision for parking on a major road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes! Ban parking altogether in Station Drive and surrounding areas. Parking in Sculthorpe Road on one side only.</td>
<td>Yes! If a tree needs to be felled it must be replaced.</td>
<td>Yes! If necessary encourage community ownership as in Feckenham</td>
<td>Yes! A doctor’s surgery / dentist</td>
<td>Yes! As above objective 4. A voluntary transport service to appointments.</td>
<td>Yes! No unnecessary building of business premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Look at parking in Station Drive as exit from Lynwood Drive can't be done safely when cars obscure vision.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - would be good to preserve a shop/PO for future, but not sure if PC can aid that!</td>
<td>Yes. How about a visiting surgery once a week? Chauffeur service into Hagley.</td>
<td>Yes. Must have ample provision for parking without encroaching on residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes by 1) cracking down on cars parking on pavements so pedestrians have to walk on the road. 2) create a roundabout at the Churchill crossroads 3) parking only on one side of Belbroughton Road 4) car park at the station</td>
<td>Yes - but be realistic as trees need to be managed to stop them getting out of hand. Ivy to be stopped from choking trees.</td>
<td>Yes - ensure the school, churches, pubs and shops continue and thrive. Also the Sports Centre and Community Centre</td>
<td>It is surely time for a medical centre in Blakedown or Belbroughton. Additional housing in Hagley is overloading the centre there. Travel to Hagley for the elderly is not easy.</td>
<td>Yes. Local shop and pub under threat from developers who want to build a supermarket. Too much and will dominate plus will be regarded as thin end if the wedge if it goes ahead.</td>
<td>Yes - but who allowed the Barrett development? How many people from Blakedown now live there? Or are they all from outside the village?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. A car park is needed for all those who use the train. Mill Lane has many cars parked there all day, whilst their owners are at work etc.</td>
<td>Yes. We are lucky to live in such a beautiful environment. It's a pity people driving along our country roads and lanes feel they can throw litter onto the verges etc.. We need a public purge on such anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>Yes - although some flexibility is need at times.</td>
<td>Yes. I'd like to see the children's play area, which has some nice equipment, covered in a 'hard' service. The grass is very long and often very wet for the children.</td>
<td>I am not quite sure what is realistic to expect in a small village. Of course it would be great not to have to travel to Kidderminster or Hagley.</td>
<td>Yes - bearing in mind my comments for objective 3, I do feel you need to be sensitive to enterprises that may affect householders as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Traffic lights at junction A456, Belbroughton Road 2 Consider making Churchill Lane one way from A456 to Mill Lane 3 Better street lighting around station access and egress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - facilities for teenagers to use locally</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Traffic lights at junction A456, Belbroughton Road 2 Consider making Churchill Lane one way from A456 to Mill Lane 3 Better street lighting around station access and egress</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes - so no convenience store in Swan car park!</td>
<td>Doctor's surgery. This should have been a S106 requirement for Barratt's development in Belbroughton Road.</td>
<td>See 4 above. A local GP surgery</td>
<td>Tight control of parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II Regulation 14 Public Consultation

List of Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations Invited to Comment on the Draft Plan by Email

Company / Organisation

London Midland
First Group Plc
Chiltern Railways
MADE
Wyre Forest Matters LSP Chair
Blakedown CE Primary School
Haybridge High School & Sixth Form
Hagley Catholic High School
Severn Valley Railway
West Midlands Consortium Education Service for Travelling Children
Natural England
Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust
Planning Aid England
DIAL North Worcestershire
Oil and Pipelines Agency (The)
Community First
Act on Energy
West Mercia Probation Service
Worcestershire County Association of Local Councils
Wyre Forest Citizens Advice Bureau
Wyre Forest Dial A Ride
Wyre Forest Cycle Forum
Worcestershire Acute Hospitals NHS Trust
Health and Safety Executive, Chemical and Hazardous Installations Division
National Farmers Union West Midlands Region
Community Action Wyre Forest (CAWF)
National Society of Allotment and Leisure Gardeners
British Horse Society
Home-Start Wyre Forest
Blakedown Holdings
West Midlands HARP Planning Consortium
The Inland Waterways Association (Birmingham, Black Country & Worcestershire Branch)
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Earth Heritage Trust
The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings
Renewable UK
Campaign for Real Ale Ltd (CAMRA)
Worcester Diocesan Board of Finance Ltd
Worcestershire County Council, Planning Economy & Performance
South Staffordshire District Council
Staffordshire County Council
Worcestershire County Council
Office of Rail Regulation
British Telecom
Mobile Operators Association
South Staffordshire Water Plc
National Grid
Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council
Broome Parish Council
Disability Action Wyre Forest
Federation of Small Businesses, Herefordshire & Worcestershire
Herefordshire & Worcestershire Chamber of Commerce
Age UK Wyre Forest
The Crown Estate
Hereford & Worcester Fire & Rescue Service
RSPB Midlands Regional Office
Home Builders Federation
The Community Housing Group
The Gardens Trust
Fields in Trust
Worcestershire Wildlife Trust
The Showmans Guild of Great Britain Midland Section
Clent Parish Council
Hagley Parish Council
Kinver Parish Council
The Victorian Society
Ramblers Association
Historic England
Hereford and Worcester Gardens Trust
Worcestershire Biodiversity Partnership
Wyre Forest Local Children’s Trust
National Travellers Action Group
Friends Families and Travellers
Wyre Forest Friends of the Earth
Centro- WMPTA
Campaign to Protect Rural England
Worcestershire County Council
Country Land & Business Association
Severn Trent Water Ltd
Stone Parish Council
West Mercia Police
Environment Agency
The Planning Inspectorate
Chaplaincy for Agricultural & Rural Life
The Coal Authority

Canal & River Trust
Chaddesley Corbett Parish Council
Inland Waterways Association
Centro- WMPTA
Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership
Worcestershire Local Enterprise Partnership
Vestia Community Trust
Department of Health
Bromsgrove & Redditch DC
Kirkwells
Western Power Distribution
North Worcestershire Housing & Water Management
Sport England
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups
Worcestershire Regulatory Services
Wyre Forest Clinical Commissioning Group
Homes and Community Agency
Callow Oils Ltd
Staffordshire County Council
NHS Property Services Ltd
Council for British Archaeology West Midlands
Woodland Trust

Worcestershire Local Nature Partnership
NHS Commissioning Board
Highways England
CAMRA WF
Copy of Email sent to Consultation Bodies

In April 2013 Churchill and Blakedown, villages in the Wyre Forest district of north Worcestershire, were designated a Neighbourhood Area under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, and began the development of a Neighbourhood Plan to shape and direct development for the villages for the next twenty-five years. A voluntary steering group of residents and Parish Councillors has been working on the development of this Plan with the help of Wyre Forest Planning Officers and of independent consultants Kirkwells. The Draft Plan is now being issued for statutory consultation to all interested or affected individuals, public bodies and organisations. The web site www.cnbdp.co.uk has been set up specifically to provide access to the Draft Plan and associated documentation (the file size of the Plan precludes sending by email attachment), and you are requested to view the Plan there.

The consultation period runs for 6 weeks from 1st November to 13th December 2015. We actively welcome, and indeed are seeking, your views on the Plan, and would ask you to complete and return a comment form, available on the www.cbndp.co.uk site, before the end of the consultation period at midnight on 13th December. We shall make publicly available all the comments we receive, and will incorporate any necessary changes into the Final Plan which will be considered by Wyre Forest District Council, and scrutinised by an independent inspector before being presented to the village residents for referendum.

If you have any queries on the Plan or the consultation process, please address these to me by return email at churchillandblakedownclerk@gmail.com.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Angela Preece
Clerk to Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council
List of Consultation Bodies and Other Organisations Invited to Comment on the Draft Plan by Post

Company / Organisation
GPU Power UK
Worcestershire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust
Arts Council West Midlands
Business Connections 4 North Worcestershire
Wyre Forest Society
Disability Action Wyre Forest
Wyre Forest Action Group for Older People
Wyre Forest Lifelong Learning Partnership
Wyre Forest Tourism and Leisure Network
Association of Retired and Persons over 50
Twentieth Century Society
Central Networks
British Geological Survey
The Georgian Group
Equality & Human Rights Commission
Staffordshire Police Authority
Transco West Midlands Local Distribution Zone
Hereford & Worcester Ambulance Service
Ramblers Association
Madinatul Uloom Islamic College
Blakedown Tenant Consultative Committee
Royal British Legion
Federation of Small Businesses, Herefordshire & Worcestershire
Civil Aviation Authority
Network Rail
Copy of Letter sent to Consultation Bodies

In April 2013 Churchill and Blakedown, villages in the Wyre Forest district of north Worcestershire, were designated a Neighbourhood Area under the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, and began the development of a Neighbourhood Plan to shape and direct development for the villages for the next twenty-five years. A voluntary steering group of residents and Parish Councillors has been working on the development of this Plan with the help of Wyre Forest Planning Officers and of independent consultants Kirkwells. The Draft Plan is now being issued for statutory consultation to all interested or affected individuals, public bodies and organisations. An electronic version of the Plan and associated documentation is available at www.cnbndp.co.uk. If you would prefer a hard copy of the Draft Plan we can arrange for you to receive one.

The consultation period runs for 6 weeks from 1st November to 13th December 2015. We actively welcome, and indeed are seeking, your views on the Plan, and would ask you to complete and return the enclosed comment form before the end of the consultation period at midnight on 13th December. We shall make publicly available all the comments we receive, and will incorporate any necessary changes into the Final Plan which will be considered by Wyre Forest District Council, and scrutinised by an independent inspector before being presented to the village residents for referendum.

If you have any queries on the Plan or the consultation process, please address these to me either by email at churchillandblakedownclerk@gmail.com, or by post to the address above.

Thank you for your attention.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Angela Preece

Clerk to Churchill and Blakedown Parish Council
Churchill & Blakedown Neighbourhood
Development Plan
Draft Plan for Consultation


We will make all comments we receive publicly available on the Churchill & Blakedown Neighbourhood Development Plan website www.cnndp.co.uk and in future reporting on this stage of the consultation process. Comments will be identifiable by name (and organisation where applicable). We are not able to consider anonymous comments.

The information you provide will only be used to inform the Churchill & Blakedown Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Any further personal details you give will be used by the Steering Group as part of the neighbourhood development process and to keep you informed of progress with the plan. We will not make them public and will process them in line with the Data Protection Act 1998.

You can view the Draft Plan online at www.cnndp.co.uk, you can read one of the printed copies which have been left in various locations (Crumps (the Village Shop), The Swan, The Old House at Home, Blakedown Primary School, Blakedown Church, Churchill Church, the Parish Rooms and the Sports Pavilion) or you can request a copy of the Draft Plan by email or post using the Clerk’s contact details below.

We are only able to consider comments made using the official form, and these must be received by midnight on Sunday 11th December 2016.

Please return this form by email to churchillandblakedownclerk@gmail.com or by post to:

The Clerk
Churchill & Blakedown Parish Council
24 Holmes Orchard
Alveley
Shropshire
WV15 6NX

If you require additional space for your response please use additional pages ensuring they are clearly labelled/addressed and attached.

Many thanks – your support is appreciated
Consultation Response Form

Please fill in your contact details.
Only your name (and organisation where applicable) will be made public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation represented (where applicable):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity in which you are commenting (Eg: resident, business or organisation in area, work in area, statutory consultee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add my email address to the Churchill & Blakedown Parish council e-news subscriber list (Please delete as appropriate)  Yes / No

Are you content with the Neighbourhood Development Plan as a whole?

Yes  [ ]  No  [ ]  [ ]
If no, please detail which policies/sections you disagree with, and make your suggestions for policy changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy / section (include page number)</th>
<th>Reasons / suggested changes / comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy / section</td>
<td>Reasons / suggested changes / comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(include page number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One thought on “Churchill & Blakehaven
Neighbourhood Development Plan”

Interact with us !