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1. Summary

The Community Council of Staffordshire undertook a wide ranging series of consultation events throughout the summer of 2014 with a view to gathering views and opinions from the general public in connection with the Local Plan Site Allocations Consultation Process. This was undertaken using a variety of methods including a series of 15 interactive community based events (open to all the community) and a range of social media outlets.

The range of events held were mixed in format, from dedicated events such as those that took place at Brewood and Perton through to a series of drop in events such as in Kinver which involved presences at the Job Club, Children’s Centre, Library, Co-Op Food Store and Leisure Centre.

The open offer of supporting Parish Councils with events had a limited take up with only a handful of councils agreeing to this approach.

The average age of those people participating in the process was within the 40-60 year age range, however in a number of communities a significant number of people in the 0-18 age range took part in the process.

On average nearly 75% of the people who took part in the process either had no prior knowledge of the whole Local Plan process or had some knowledge but had not taken part in it to date.

The majority of those attending were very active in expressing their views on the site preferences (the dots on maps process) but less so on providing comments that contained material planning considerations. There was a certain amount of reluctance to provide thoughts and views on community facilities and house types, considering that this would be viewed as an acceptance of the principle of development in the community.

In terms of specific comments and views on villages and sites, these are set out within this document.

General comments from people engaging in the process were wide ranging however there were some common concerns expressed and these related to the following: a) a general view that most of the villages had been developed enough and no more development should take place, b) existing traffic through the villages was unacceptable and new development would compound the problems, c) existing facilities could not cope with new development and in particular references were made about GP surgeries and d) a need for affordable housing.

2. Commission

South Staffordshire Council as part of their Local Plan Consultation Process commissioned the Community Council of Staffordshire to undertake an independent widespread community consultation exercise across the district of South Staffordshire focussing on those communities that were the subject of potential development. The community consultation events held by the Community Council of Staffordshire were in addition to exhibitions organised by South Staffordshire Council. South Staffordshire Council was keen to ensure that consultation on the Local Plan should reach communities and people within communities that would not normally engage in the process and set out key features of the work as follows.
**Overall aim of the project**

The consultation events should complement the Council's own consultation efforts, through addressing concerns or issues that may not be raised during discussions focused on the allocation of specific sites. It should instead, amongst other things, focus on gathering community views on the generally preferred locations for development in the settlements, without focusing on specific site proposals. These events should get a sense of the desires, aspirations and worries of the community in relation to the future development of their village. In this capacity, it is intended that the appointed organisation should act as an ‘honest broker’ with the community, through being able to gather community views independently of the Council.

In doing so, a key priority should be reaching as wide a cross-section of the community as possible (including hard-to-reach groups) through accessible and easily understood methods, rather than focusing on those more likely to engage with the planning process. This will help to inform the final document's allocation of sites for housing and employment, amongst other uses.

**3. Consultation Approach**

The main approach taken by the Community Council was to deliver the consultation exercise in the communities, through the use of existing community events. The use of existing events as a means of community engagement is now accepted as good practice and it uses the principle of taking the process to the community rather than expecting the community to come to the process.

The Community Council together with the support of the District Council offered their services to all of the parish councils in the district with a view to helping them to support/organise any events in their community. This joint approach would have the added advantage of helping the parish council to be better informed when making their views known on the Local Plan Consultation. Where parish councils did not take up this offer the Community Council identified local events and secured a presence at these.

At each event the Community Council chose a “market stall” style of delivery and created an interactive approach to engagement with the public. This consisted of maps of each community with the potential development sites suitably identified upon which the public were asked for their preferences in terms of development. In addition those attending the events were asked to complete a comments form and were encouraged to consider at this stage any material planning considerations when completing these. Guidance was given on the meaning of material planning considerations by the District Council.

In addition to the maps the public were also asked for their views on: a) the community benefits that might be derived from any new development and b) the range of house types that they felt their local community needed.

The events that the Community Council attended were varied and held at different times of the day, during the week and at weekends, including Bank Holidays, thus providing maximum opportunity to attract and engage a wide range and mix of people. These ranged from dedicated events ie. Brewood, Perton through to ‘drop-in’ events, eg. Job Club, Children’s Centre, Library, Village Fetes and a Co-op Food Store/Post Office at Wombourne.

In addition to the community based events the Community Council took advantage of the internet and social media to communicate with a wide audience. This included the use of Facebook, Twitter, Survey Monkey and the development of a dedicated web site for the process.

Approaches were made to a number of schools and youth clubs with a view to developing a focussed piece of work around young people but due to the timing of the process (through the summer) this was not possible to enact.
4. Conclusions

a) The Process

From the collection of data the process employed would appear to have been successful.

A substantial number of people attended the events with a significant number who would otherwise not have taken part (75%). A connection was made with a wide range of age groups including number of younger people. It was a little disappointing that the schools that were approached did not take part however, we are aware that their timetables are very often fixed 9 to 12 months in advance.

The offer to work with parish councils was not taken up at the level that we would have hoped; however on those occasions where this did take place (notably Brewood and Per ton) it produced very effective results. It is our view that some parish councils may have felt that their involvement in any event would be misinterpreted by their parishioners as their agreement to development.

The varied range of events that were used as the basis for the consultation was a very effective means of engaging with people new to the process. The use of village fetes, church fetes, and historic society events together with drop in events based at the library, Job Club and Children’s Centres allowed for a greater reach to the community.

The event at Per ton, which was a dedicated event for the consultation, had landowners present, and despite our initial misgiving about this, it was well received by the public and would be an approach that is worth considering again in the future.

The process of obtaining people’s views on site preferences was engaging, however those who attended felt that giving views on community benefits and house types was tantamount to agreeing to the principle of development. This resulted in residents’ reluctance to participate in this part of the process as it might give the impression of an acceptance to future local development.

b) Community Views

The community were enthusiastic in providing their views on site preferences but were understandably finding it difficult to justify their reasoning using material planning considerations; this is something that is quite alien to the ‘man in the street’. The overriding view from all communities seems to be that each village has already been developed to capacity.

Concerns were expressed about existing traffic problems and the potential that new development would compound these problems. In addition, people were concerned about the strain that new development would put on existing facilities, most notably GP surgeries and schools.

A number of people who did attend the events made comments relating to the district council process. The most common comment was a lack of awareness of the events that were held, some people not being aware that the District Council event had taken place in their community a few weeks earlier.

A number of people raised the issue of the District Council Consultation web site, taking the view that it was difficult to navigate and the plans were illegible.
5. Events Reports
# Potential Community Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Bilbrook</th>
<th>Brewood</th>
<th>Cheslyn Hay</th>
<th>Codsall</th>
<th>Covens</th>
<th>Featherstone</th>
<th>Gt Wyrley</th>
<th>Huntington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Recreational Facilities (tennis, bowls, football)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Space and Equipment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Mix (starter, bungalows, apartments, sheltered)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building (new or improved)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Improvements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP Surgery, Chemist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Centre Improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial Grounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support setting up community groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Work - Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops and Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Returned Forms</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Attendees</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*November 2014* Community Council of Staffordshire
## POTENTIAL COMMUNITY BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Kinver</th>
<th>Pattingham</th>
<th>Penkridge</th>
<th>Perton</th>
<th>Swindon</th>
<th>Wheaton Aston</th>
<th>Wombourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Recreational Facilities (tennis, bowls, football)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Space and Equipment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Mix (starter, bungalows, apartments, sheltered)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building (new or improved)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Improvements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP Surgery, Chemist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Centre Improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial Grounds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Pool</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support setting up community groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Work - Cultural Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pub</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shops and Retail</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of returned forms</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number of attendees</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Community Council of Staffordshire
## Initial feedback on-site preferences

### Bilbrook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Brewood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cheslyn Hay*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very low numbers contributing to the whole process

### Codsall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very few numbers

### Coven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Featherstone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397/168</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very low numbers contributing to the whole process

This is a small sample of views expressed at the Community Council of Staffordshire exhibitions
### Initial feedback on-site preferences

#### Penkridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Great Wyrley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Huntington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Kinver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pattingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Perton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>246a</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239/407</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238a</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a small sample of views expressed at the Community Council of Staffordshire exhibitions.
Initial feedback on-site preferences

Swindon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wheaton Aston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wombourne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281a</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281b</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very few numbers

This is a small sample of views expressed at the Community Council of Staffordshire exhibitions
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# Housing site preferences

## Bilbrook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>209</th>
<th>210</th>
<th>211</th>
<th>213</th>
<th>Land off Watery Lane</th>
<th>Land off Pendford Mill Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Brewood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>68</th>
<th>376</th>
<th>Land off Barge Street</th>
<th>GP Surgery Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cheslyn Hay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>115</th>
<th>116</th>
<th>118</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>120</th>
<th>424</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The residents who have expressed their views or attended the events are likely to be those living near one of the allocated sites.
## Housing site preferences

### Codsall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>220</th>
<th>221</th>
<th>222</th>
<th>223</th>
<th>224</th>
<th>225</th>
<th>228</th>
<th>406</th>
<th>419</th>
<th>425</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>080</th>
<th>082</th>
<th>084</th>
<th>085</th>
<th>086</th>
<th>087</th>
<th>100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Featherstone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>167</th>
<th>168</th>
<th>169</th>
<th>170</th>
<th>171</th>
<th>172</th>
<th>395</th>
<th>397</th>
<th>433</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The residents who have expressed their views or attended the events are likely to be those living near one of the allocated sites.
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## Housing site preferences

### Great Wyrley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>136</th>
<th>137</th>
<th>138</th>
<th>139</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>145</th>
<th>440</th>
<th>441</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Huntington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>012</th>
<th>013</th>
<th>014</th>
<th>015</th>
<th>016</th>
<th>017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kinver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>270</th>
<th>271</th>
<th>272</th>
<th>273</th>
<th>274a</th>
<th>274b</th>
<th>409</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing site preferences

### Pattingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>249</th>
<th>250</th>
<th>251</th>
<th>252</th>
<th>253</th>
<th>401</th>
<th>421</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Penkridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>001</th>
<th>003</th>
<th>004</th>
<th>005</th>
<th>006</th>
<th>420</th>
<th>430</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>238a</th>
<th>239</th>
<th>241</th>
<th>246a</th>
<th>402</th>
<th>407</th>
<th>Wycombsley Park Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The residents who have expressed their views or attended the events are likely to be those living near one of the allocated sites.
## Housing site preferences

### Swindon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>312a</th>
<th>313</th>
<th>314</th>
<th>315</th>
<th>437</th>
<th>Greyhound Pub 1</th>
<th>Unknown 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wheaton Aston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>93/377</th>
<th>378</th>
<th>379</th>
<th>422</th>
<th>426</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>439</th>
<th>442</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The residents who have expressed their views or attended the events are likely to be those living near one of the allocated sites.
## Housing site preferences

The residents who have expressed their views or attended the events are likely to be those living near one of the allocated sites.

### Wombourne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>279</th>
<th>280</th>
<th>281a</th>
<th>281b</th>
<th>282</th>
<th>283</th>
<th>284</th>
<th>285</th>
<th>287/288</th>
<th>289</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Ref</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>302</th>
<th>415</th>
<th>438</th>
<th>416</th>
<th>417</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

November 2014
Sample of community housing needs

Sample survey of people’s views on the types of houses that the community need.

A note of caution in that some respondents may have used this process to express their personal need/desire for a particular house types.

Bungalows were consistently popular, which may be down to the age range of those participating although in general terms the population does favour bungalows.

In those areas where people expressed a view about affordable housing it scored very high.

Detached houses were also popular which again may be explained by the desire factor rather than what the community need.
6. Key Service Village Reports
Community Council of Staffordshire

South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 4 – Central – Bilbrook

1. Potential community benefit

- Sports & Recreation Facilities – extension to skate park
- Play spaces & equipment/Community Building – Bigger playground for younger children
- Housing Mix – If built on Bilbrook House need new premises.
- Housing Mix – Starter, affordable.
- Road Improvements – State of roads and footpaths, pot holes.
- Road Improvements – Traffic lights needed at Woodman PH
- School – Birches First School needs to be extended
- Community Facilities – Need to replace Bilbrook House facilities if this is developed

2. General comments

Triangle Bilbrook Road, near High School – why not use that land? useful size.

i54 will encourage more traffic onto Wobaston Road.

Traffic lights required at Woodman Public House.

3. Site specific references

Site Reference No. 209 – Lane Green Road

Along Lane Green Road is very picturesque and should be kept for the community.

In the corner of 209 - Along the side of Aldersley School. The new BMX track, does not seem to be used and is now in dis-repair.

No more houses on Lane Green Road due to traffic using road as a race run already, will make it worse.

Done deal on 209 site?

Traffic congestion - takes 10 minutes to get out. No objection to houses but need traffic improvements.
Site Reference No. 210 – Land off Lane Green Avenue/Road

Very concerned about the congestion to traffic this site would cause on what is already a busy road into the area. The site is located on a bad bend which is very busy, particularly at school dropping off and picking up times. Also concerned as Birches First School is also oversubscribed and an additional number of houses at this site would cause additional pressures on places and infrastructure of the area.

Urbanisation from Wolverhampton getting nearer!

Landowner of 210 says we were fair on offering views to community residents.

Site Reference 211 – Land North of Manor House Park

I think if more houses were built in this area it would cause more traffic through Manor House Park unless there is an alternative route of access.

I am not happy about site 211, it gets waterlogged, it is very popular with dog walkers. We are already stretched on our facilities. We need housing for our local people and not outsiders.

Bilbrook Rd (the site by the brook - flooding) – My house backs on to the fields where the site may be. The area of fields floods. This year especially, the brook burst its banks. I've lived there 25 years and never seen it that bad. Also, it will destroy the landscape at the back of our houses. What about our house prices. The area is well used for dog walking and walkers, to destroy this would be horrific.

Culvert required. Preferred site with no traffic issues.

Bilbrook needs to be kept as it is. This is only area of ‘wild’ land which is accessible to the public. Please just consider the wildlife and the other occupants of our village who don’t get a vote, i.e. the animals, birds and insects etc.

Site Reference 213 – Bilbrook House, Carter Avenue

Bilbrook would prefer it to be on Site 213 as it is existing built land. Would like it to be for local residents.

Already built area and would make good building stock.

Bilbrook House is a community facility that is central for all residents of Bilbrook. So even if it is re-located it would not be accessible.

Would need replacement building for Busy Minds.
4. Housing types

Need more affordable homes for young people and families and for local Bilbrook people.

More family housing, especially 3 and 4 bedroom homes. Mixture of social, affordable and private housing. Bilbrook needs more parking for the shopping areas and more play areas. The Skate Park is very well used.

All sites need more housing, i.e. single storey development for over 60’s. Let local people get housing preference! Also housing for local youngsters, either rented or affordable! NOT 4-5 bed homes.

5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’
- Sports & recreational facilities
- Housing mix
- Play space & equipment/Community building

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance and Age Profile

- Bilbrook:
  - Attendee Estimate: 28
  - Registration: 20

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed

...concerned as Birches First School is also oversubscribed...
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken as part of the very popular annual local church street fete, a day long outdoors event that took place in the centre of Bilbrook. Whilst the event was supported by the Parish Council there was little obvious presence on the day of councillors at the stall.

Our stall was attended by a varied cross section of the community covering all age ranges and family mixes, many of whom had either not heard about the Local Plan Consultation Process or had not been able to attend the District Council event.

The overriding general comments being made by those that attended our stall related to the; a) increase in traffic that any new development would generate throughout the village and in particular traffic travelling east to west (towards Wolverhampton) and also to the new Jaguar plant at the I54, b) preservation of the gap between the village and Wolverhampton c) the affordability of housing.

In terms of Community Benefits, these predominately related to an increase in facilities for young people and children and highway improvements. In addition concerns were expressed about the potential loss of Bilbrook House and the need to retain this type of easily accessed facility in the centre of the village.

With regard to the potential sites, site 209 was the most favoured numerically with 213 the least favoured. A number of people raised the issue of flooding in respect of site 211. In addition one land owner offered forward a site which was not part of the process and he was referred to the district council.

In terms of housing mix the general feelings being expressed were that there needs to be more affordable housing.
Site Allocations
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Community Council of Staffordshire
Community Council of Staffordshire

South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 2 – North West – Brewood

1. Potential community benefit

- Sports and Recreational Facilities
  - sports centre
  - not a new Leisure Centre
  - extension to existing sports fields

- Transport
  - need improved bus services

- Housing Mix
  - starter, sheltered homes

- Road Improvements
  - making people know what double yellow lines mean outside Spar.
  - traffic calming 20mph

- Car Parking
  - more needed
  - stop on-street parking on Dean Street
  - a problem in the centre and side roads

- Village Centre Improvements
  - one-way road system

- Health - GP surgery needs to be enlarged

- Community Buildings
  - need attention

- Other
  - scout hut
  - a better bus service serving the estates of Brewood.
  - regular bus service to Wolverhampton and Stafford
2. General comments

I believe that the proposed GP surgery site should be enlarged enough to accommodate the required housing.

Potential to re-develop bungalows on Engleton Lane (as per existing developments).

Future developers should be required to contribute towards local facilities (such as schooling).

The ‘Sandpits’ improvement was a fantastic benefit derived from Beaconsfield development. So-called benefits such as parking, shops, road improvements – these things urbanise rural areas and must be resisted! Please do not allow any urbanisation of any description, no signs, speed bumps etc.

All green belt land should be used for agricultural use and should not be used for house building – this country has a fixed land mass – concrete and tarmac it all over and we kill off our agriculture and become dependent on other countries to feed us – Is this really a good thing – I don’t think so.

If any starter homes are ever built – they must have a clause preventing them being enlarged and therefore not being affordable for other first time buyers.

Four Ashes and Engleton Lane – has no traffic implications for the village, would keep in with the style of houses in the area, easy access from the A5. These 2 sites would be ideal to include the doctor’s surgery for the above reasons.

Development off Horsebrook Lane – Making bad traffic hazardous congestion worse.

Doctors surgery (old) will create space for building. Why is this not shown?

In general – better to have small groups rather than 53 all in one place, eg 5/6 small pockets dotted around the village – no big impact on anyone and shared fairly around residents.

Why have two sites been excluded for development, ie doctor’s surgery – Sandy Lane and Scout Hut in Deansfield Road?

Brewood shops and retail – rent too expensive, in turn passes on to customer. Community buildings need attention, becoming costly to hire.

For future expansion of village, most sustainable and least impact on green belt and village infrastructure, development should be on the north east side of the village. A larger site, rather than piecemeal development, would be preferable. This would also leave scope for future expansion.

New houses should be spread around the sites available. The smaller pockets of land should be used.

Brewood will need a site for a new Scout Hut. The present site is leased from the County Council.
They have refused to renew the lease. The Scouts understand they could be asked to leave with 6 months’ notice. As the existing hut is old it will not be possible to move it. Therefore the scouts will need to fund a hut as well as land.

Whichever site is chosen needs to take into account the extra number of cars it will generate. It would also be a better alternative to include the new medical centre next to the housing. The site in Engleton Lane is near to another new development and less likely to suffer from flooding.

This village cannot sustain any more vehicles therefore the new development would need to be part of an overall extension of parking facilities, especially long-stay parking by residents and ramblers. Some part of the village centre also needs to be one-way.

Would prefer any development to be sited to the east of the village. Any development to the east of the village would be to advantage in minimising the traffic through the village – commuters for Wolverhampton/M 54/Birmingham/Stafford/M 6 would exit the village without the need to come through the already congested village centre. Also pedestrian traffic has footpaths to the shops and schools.

Almost all Brewood traffic heads to Wolverhampton, and the Midlands conurbation every day for work, leisure and entertainment. This creates a great deal of traffic through the village centre. Any development on the north side of the village, or the west side of the village, will just add to this traffic chaos within the village centre. When the new health centre opens, great number of patients will be making their way on foot, some with children, disabled and people in cars. All passing through the centre of the village towards the health centre. If for example, development was allowed in Horsebrook Lane, patients heading for the health centre from Deansfield estates and Four Ashes Road, would encounter all this traffic. Plus the existing traffic going to and from St Dominic’s, as well as traffic to and from J B Sands. Shop Lane is very narrow, with no pavements, plus most of Bargate Lane without pavements. The heavy construction traffic during the building work would be a disaster for the village and residents. The village would avoid all of this disastrous legacy if development was only allowed on the south and east side of the village. 9 housing sites should be considered.

All sites – Brewood cannot cope with 110 extra cars.

Preferred site – Stonebridge and Raven Grove/Oak Road. There is a natural extension to Stonebridge Road and highlighted as a suitable site 15 years ago. It would be logical to extend the site to accommodate all required building onto the Rowan Grove site, providing an exit onto Four Ashes Road.

Could the field in Kiddemore Green Lane earmarked for doctor’s surgery be a contender?

Doctor’s surgery – develop the back of the site.

Dean Street a better one way system.

Develop GP surgery good idea to develop the site.
3. Site specific references

Site Reference No.053 – Land off Horsebrook Lane

This site is totally unsuitable due to the access from Bargate and Shop Lane. The roads are too narrow. Traffic bad now would be a total nightmare with 100+ more cars.

All road junctions on Bargate Lane and Shop Lane are narrow and dangerous. They cannot be expected to take increased traffic volumes.

Horrendous access via Bargate Lane, Shop Lane (both no pavements) and very awkward junction Bargate Lane/Bargate Street – Hence No.

Houses needed - but why are the new houses already built not taken into consideration (eg Admiral Rodney houses) Why this magical number of 10?

053 is totally unsuitable because of very poor access on narrow lanes to the north and south, it would also greatly affect a whole road of residents who back onto these beautiful green field sites. Also spoil view from the canal conservation area.

053 is not at all suitable. The access from Bargate Street and Shop Lane is terrible as it is already used by tractors, lorries, etc going down Horsebrook Lane – No more traffic.

Site 053 would cause more problems with access whichever way it was approached. The site would have the most impact on the village centre with traffic during building and afterwards.

Not 053 - access hopeless for emergency/large vehicles – ruin views of village from canal and outwards. Must ensure affordable housing and housing for the elderly (eg bungalows) are adhered to in giving planning permission.

Access to site is not suitable for the amount of traffic, i.e. Shop Lane, Bargate Lane. Would the houses be affordable? Would the village amenities be able to cope with the extra population and traffic? How would you improve the infrastructure? When are these properties expected to be built (before new surgery or after)?

Good housing site, but local access into village at junction with Streets Lane very poor. Could not accommodate all SS housing.

Against - 053 Horsebrook Lane already has heavy farm traffic and is heavily used for school drop off/pick up. There is no pavement from the end of Horsebrook Lane on Bargate Lane or Shop Lane. (Highly dangerous if pushing wheelchairs/pushchairs). Also, fire engine is situated on Bargate Lane - extra pedestrian traffic could cause them problems when “on a shout”.

I am concerned about the capability of the junction at the top of Horsebrook Lane and between Bargate Lane and Bargate Street to take the traffic generated by 053.

Horsebrook Lane traffic issues – good dry site.
Horsebrook Lane weighbridge problem for 30/40 tonne vehicles

Unfortunately my comments and my wife's opinion sound like the usual NIMBY response, but Horsebrook Lane site and Fallowfield sites are not safe in terms of traffic safety and also Fallowfield site has issues in terms of green belt. Their use would lead to traffic being forced through the village.

Horsebrook Lane has farm traffic, horses from riding school, lorries to farm for weighbridge, stage coaches, horse drawn carriages, pony and traps all from Horsebrook Manor, traffic from caravan park half a mile away, plus day to day traffic, how much more do you want us to take? It's a no brainer. Imagine all this and extra traffic new houses will make. Just use your loaves!

Site Reference No.054 -- Engleton Lane

054 or 055 preferred.

Appears to be the most logical site to build on as the access is already in place. This site would have the least impact on the village whilst it was built and would not affect the appearance of the old part of the village. This site would not require access through the village centre as this is already a major problem.

Access is narrow, would impact on the football pitches and also mainly traffic flow would be horrific having lived here for 5 years. Traffic is too fast already and too narrow. We are in danger of being surrounded by too many estates. This village is known for its beautiful character and original features. We need more smaller developments of say 10-20 houses, which the youth of existing residents are able to afford to stay in the village (Ie Admiral Rodney gardens, designed tastefully). Site 54 would be ideal for extending the recreational facilities, maybe a sports hall and possibly allotments.

I feel we have to be careful of not making Brewood into a small town. We pride ourselves in preserving its heritage. We came from West Bromwich to live in this beautiful village 6 years ago and should site 54 be developed then feel sadly we would be forced to move to another village as we moved away from West Bromwich to escape suburban life (full of estates). We prefer more smaller houses than larger.

Site 054 would be preferred site.

Would like to see area immediately by recreational ground preserved.

Site 54 should be preserved for recreational purposes being adjacent to already established football and cricket pitches. The problem with Brewood is that all developments in the past have been very much ribbon development and, therefore there is plenty of space to infill behind eg. Kiddemore Green Road.

The only option for building in my opinion would be 054 as traffic from the new estate could have egress out to the main roads without affecting the flow of vehicles through the village.

055 and 054 - Out of the alternatives, the site at Engleton and Four Ashes appear better in terms of traffic safety and accessibility. We all appreciate that in the current climate houses must be built,
but we must consider the effect on the village environment and try to build with a vision of the long term consequences

**Site Reference No. 055 – Four Ashes Road**

055 and 068 – Risk of flooding in these two areas. They already flood now – this is only going to get worse with climate change.

Plenty of space below Tinker’s Lane. Shame about the view if you have houses in front – it’s a matter of priorities.

055 on Four Ashes Road – car access already there, natural continuation of village line. Off Four Ashes Road – where is the car access? What about flood plains? Are we creating ‘flood danger’ for the future?

The site 55 would spoil the beautiful aspect of the village when approaching it from the A5 or A449. Once gone it can never be regained. Are you aware of the amount of traffic coming into the village to the 4 schools in a morning? A count needs to be made and an awareness of the speed of this traffic.

The larger site 55 would be too big for 53 homes and if building were to be done on there a precedent would be set to develop rest of the field. Brewood does not need 100’s of homes. Small affordable homes or sheltered homes need to be built. Any new homes will put huge pressures on main roads in Brewood and parking.

This would present the best location as it would have the least impact on traffic through the village since Wolverhampton, Stafford, Cannock represent the largest amount of employment, hence traffic. Also would have the least impact on other residents. This location would also be more suitable for a doctor's surgery for the above reasons, especially considering the catchment area is 200,000 people, including Cannock and Stafford residents.

On edge of village, reducing through traffic. Not next to heritage assets. Not next to conservation area. Access to main road better.

We prefer site 55. Mainly because this doesn’t really infringe on the traffic flow through village as can be accessed from Four Ashes Road and A449. Access for children to walk from and to school is safe.

Concerned about flooding and road access (causing flooding onto level land). Site 068 – as above, also concerned about increased traffic onto small housing estate that already has many cars on Stonebridge Road restricting access for other road users and emergency services. Drainage capacity questionable in this area.

055 immediately off Four Ashes Road the preferred site.

I feel that site 55 would have been ideal for the proposed doctor’s surgery to avoid traffic either vehicular or pedestrian moving through the village from the north where the majority of patients live. For – 055 site – This site is situated on a wider road (along which the Wolverhampton to Stafford bus travels), which is gritted in winter and would provide access to the village (Stafford/Wolverhampton).
for new car users and pedestrians alike. There is a full footpath down to the site (which could be
continued as necessary along Four Ashes Road). The site is almost opposite the Cricket Club and
BPSA Ground for sports/social activities. NB: I understand that the sewerage system will need to be
upgraded and this could simply be moved further down the field and rebuilt to accommodate all the
potential new build homes, leaving the original sewerage site available for housing to be built on.

055 and 068 – Sewerage problems need to be taken into account also busy roads going onto lane.
No buses going this way. Need to take into account lack of decent bus service including Sundays,
should be encouraging public transport for the environment and job prospects, students.

055 and 054 - Out of the alternatives, the site at Engleton and Four Ashes appear better in terms
of traffic safety and accessibility. We all appreciate that in the current climate houses must be built,
but we must consider the effect on the village environment and try to build with a vision of the long
term consequences.

**Site Reference No. 068 – Land off Oak Road/Rowan Road**

The site already has problems with water and flooding with the environmental changes that are
taking place and will continue to take place in the future, there can be no misunderstanding that the
impacts today will continue and will inevitably get worse. The road infrastructure is also very near to
breaking point with the number of vehicles that are owned by the current residents. Most families
have at least two cars and these will increase over time and is increasing today. We have children
playing and there are concerns over safety. No one, as yet, has been injured but it is only a matter
of time! I would like to see more smaller sites than one large site.

Drainage system cannot cope with rainwater already. Gardens are flooded due to overflow from
drains. The road itself is very straight therefore traffic speed would be high if the access road was
via Stonebridge Road.

068 and part of 055 - should be preferred site. This site has ample space to put both the current
requirement and the 2028+ requirement. This site will allow traffic to easily get out to the A5, A449
and M6. Also the roads at this part of the village are modern wide roads that can accommodate the
larger traffic volume. Access to both sites should be off the Four Ashes Road.

I have lived in Stonebridge Road for 13 years. As I live in one of the 3 houses down the bottom by
the field, I repeatedly suffer from flooding issues every year when the rain is heavy for a long period
of time water comes up from the toilets and sinks. Furthermore there are numerous trees on this
land, so therefore if the council decide to build houses on this, they will be damaging the natural
resources and the environment. Along with the flood risk, the brook piles over into the stream in the
wet weather then that comes onto our land to put the risk in greater danger.

I do not wish you to build on area 068 as there are many children, small children including one of my
family members who plays out on the street, so if you were to build this would create more danger
to the children as the street would be busier with cars going up and down.

Having lived on Stonebridge Road for 13 years, I have progressively had more of a problem with
flood risk. Over the last several years many insurers will not consider my property as we are at risk.
This area is not suitable for building. My grassed areas do not ever dry out. In addition to this, in
stormy weather, I get sewage in both upstairs and downstairs sinks and toilets. The brook overflow gets full to the brim. There are several protected trees in this area. Many children play in this area and more cars would be a danger. We also have many sunken paving stones on our rear garden which have moved over the years. Fortunately, our house is built on foundations.

I live in Stonebridge Road and can confirm that the area 068 is prone to consistent flooding. Our rear garden, which is located nearer to the stream, is consistently wet, even in the height of summer. Furthermore, mortgage lenders have significantly tightened their lending criteria, and I have just experienced great difficulty in securing a re-mortgage due to flood risk. I am also extremely concerned that development of this land will lead to a “through road” with speeding traffic, putting the lives of children and elderly in Stonebridge Road at risk. Additionally, we had a conservatory built in 2002 that had to be rebuilt due to subsidence.

055 and 068 – Risk of flooding in these two areas. They already flood now - this is only going to get worse with climate change.

Access to this site was improved by removing the tiny bridge at the bottom of Sparrow’s End Lane. Stonebridge Road has ‘sleeping policemen’ on it and could carry additional traffic. The site keeps Brewood compact and does not spoil the aesthetic quality of the village. Residents on this site would be within easy walking distance of the village centre; none of the alternative sites can say this!

Flood plain with sewage backing up into Stonebridge Road houses. Hence No.

As residents of the development on Stonebridge Road, we have experienced severe issues with drainage. Future developments and therefore demand will impact negatively on the drainage system, this will have potentially health and safety issues. This area will be affected by climate change. The volume of access traffic will increase on Stonebridge Road, which will affect the safety of children and residents already in existence.

Major concerns from an environmental point Stonebridge Road houses already struggle to get home insurance due to flood risk. The site contains a brook and is in flood zone 3. Houses previously built here are already on very deep piling. Drains on the existing development back up in heavy rain. Trees lining the brook are protected. I fully support the need to build and ensure the village thrives, but feel there are many more suitable sites.

Any houses in 068 - car access via Hall Farm Road? Already over-used by new owners in previous ‘new build’ or Sparrow End again new owners ignoring No Entry sign.

Any “new road” from site 68 to Four Ashes Road would create a “by pass” through Stonebridge Road - not a good idea. Overall site 68 would be my preferred area.

068 would be the preferred site with the proviso that an access road is made from Four Ashes Road.

A logical place to build new housing – a natural extension of Stonebridge with a good road access to the south and west – unlikely to upset many people because not overlooked. The drainage problem was successfully overcome when building Stonebridge and could be similarly overcome on 068. 068 should be extended to include a strip of 055, ideally with access up to the Four Ashes Road and out to the north and east.
Site 068 is on a flood plain and if built on, what impact would be made on the existing properties during high rainfall?

Would go for the Stonebridge 068 site for development - minimum visual impact - access ok.

Concerned about flooding and road access (causing flooding onto level land). Also concerned about increased traffic onto small housing estate that already has many cars on Stonebridge Road restricting access for other road users and emergency services. Drainage capacity questionable in this area.

055 and 068 - Sewerage problems need to be taken into account also busy roads going onto lane. No buses going this way. Need to take into account lack of decent bus service including Sundays, should be encouraging public transport for the environment and job prospects, students.

Site Reference No. 376 – Land at Fallowfield, off Horsebrook Lane/Barn Lane

Totally unsuitable as Horsebrook Lane is too narrow at this point. Not part of the village boundary.

All road junctions on Bargate Lane and Shop Lane are narrow and dangerous. They cannot be expected to take increased traffic volumes.

Horrendous access via Bargate Lane, Shop Lane (both no pavements) and very awkward junction Bargate Lane/Bargate Street – Hence No.

376 is totally unsuitable because of very poor access on narrow lanes to the north and south, it would also greatly affect a whole road of residents who back onto these beautiful green field sites. Also spoil view from the canal conservation area.

Is not at all suitable. The access from Bargate Street and Shop Lane is terrible as it is already used by tractors, lorries, etc going down Horsebrook Lane - No more traffic.

Site 376 has the same problems as Site 053 which would cause more problems with access whichever way it was approached. The site would have the most impact on the village centre with traffic during building and afterwards.

Not 376 – access hopeless for emergency/large vehicles – ruin views of village from canal and outwards. Must ensure affordable housing and housing for the elderly (eg bungalows) are adhered to in giving planning permission.

Access to site is not suitable for the amount of traffic, i.e. Shop Lane, Bargate Lane. Would the houses be affordable? Would the village amenities be able to cope with the extra population and traffic? How would you improve the infrastructure? When are these properties expected to be built (before new surgery or after)?

376 same concerns as 053 - good housing site, but local access into village at junction with Streets Lane very poor. Could not accommodate all SS housing.

Against - 376 Horsebrook Lane already has heavy farm traffic and is heavily used for school drop off/pick up. There is no pavement from the end of Horsebrook Lane on Bargate Lane or Shop Lane.
(Highly dangerous if pushing wheelchairs/pushchairs). Also, fire engine is situated on Bargate Lane - extra pedestrian traffic could cause them problems when “on a shout”.

I am concerned about the capability of the junction at the top of Horsebrook Lane and between Bargate Lane and Bargate Street to take the traffic generated by 376.

Horsebrook Lane traffic issues - good dry site.

Horsebrook Lane weighbridge problem for 30/40 tonne vehicles

Kiddemore Green Lane, Horsebrook Lane, Four Ashes Road. – I feel it is essential for the future of the village that affordable houses for young families has the same priority as more expensive homes.

Horsebrook Lane is my preferred site – its situation is closest to the village centre. The lower end of Four Ashes seems to be on a flood plain – could present problems.

Unfortunately my comments and my wife’s opinion sound like the usual NIMBY response, but Horsebrook Lane site and Fallowfield site are not safe in terms of traffic safety and also Fallowfield site has issues in terms of green belt. Their use would lead to traffic being forced through the village.

Horsebrook Lane has farm traffic, horses from riding school, lorries to farm for weighbridge, stage coaches, horse drawn carriages, pony and traps all from Horsebrook Manor, traffic from caravan park half a mile away, plus day to day traffic, how much more do you want us to take? It’s a no brainer. Imagine all this and extra traffic new houses will make. Just use your loaves!
4. Housing Types
Too small a response to statistically measure.

5. Facilitator's Report

Community Benefits 'top three'

- Car parking
- Road improvements
- Sports & recreational facilities

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brewood</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site No</td>
<td>Yes %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance and Age Profile

Consultee Awareness

Unaware of the whole process
Aware but had not contributed
Aware and already contributed
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken as stand-alone event held in the centrally located offices of the Parish Council, with their full support. It took place on late afternoon and early evening with a number of parish councillors contributing.

The event was very well attended by the community with predominance towards middle aged and older people. It was obvious that the community were aware of the Local Plan Consultation process although there were still a significant number who attended that had either not heard of the process or were unable to take part in the district council event.

General comments were made over; a) the loss of Green Belt and b) increased traffic through the village.

In terms of community benefits, those attending focused on a wide variety of potential benefits with the following being most common; a) additional sports and recreational facilities, b) improvements to bus services, c) additional car parking and d) a new scout hut.

With regard to the potential sites there appeared to be an even view on whether development should take place on one site or a mix of smaller sites scattered across the village.

Attendees consistently referred to flooding issues in relation to Site 068.

In terms of housing mix the general feelings being expressed were that there is a need for more affordable housing as well as sheltered accommodation and bungalows.
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Community Council of Staffordshire

South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 3 – North East – Cheslyn Hay

1. Potential community benefit

- Sports & Recreation Facilities
  – already exists

- Play Space and Equipment
  – already exists

- Burial Grounds
  – The new site near Strawberry Lane floods so improvement would be good.

- Swimming Pool
  – already exists

- Schools
  – Need for extra places at schools

- Housing Mix
  – Need more affordable housing

- Village Centre
  – Need more parking on High Street

- Parking
  – Need more car parking especially around the school

2. General comments

Will lorries be banned from using the main village as an access route? This is the same with B S Eaton.

I would rather see houses than quarry extension.

What provision will be made for schools in the area? There is already a waiting list. Have any brown field sites been considered?

We need more affordable housing for young people in the area to promote community feel.
No notice given, letter to resident would have been useful, even if it was just local residents to the sites. Lack of publicity. Relyed on your banner and A boards on site.

More thought/control speed on one-way system!

3. Site specific references

Site Reference No.115 – New Horse Road
No comments received.

Site Reference No.116 – Land South of Wolverhampton Road, Campions Wood Quarry

116 and 118 - These sites were being monitored in the winter for flooding. What works will have to be carried out in order to make the ground safe? This site is an open quarry. Can you build this close to a quarry? Noise pollution.

Site Reference No.118 – Land East of Wolverhampton Road

116 and 118 - These sites were being monitored in the winter for flooding. What works will have to be carried out in order to make the ground safe?

Site Reference No.119 – Land off Saredon Road

Site 120, 119 - Better parking at shelter housing site would relieve parking issues on High Street, Cheslyn Hay.

I would prefer the use of this site as it would assist with traffic flow for the school, especially in a morning. Is there a car park?

Site Reference No.120 – Land adj. Wood Green

Site 120, 119 - Better parking at shelter housing site would relieve parking issues on High Street, Cheslyn Hay.

Site Reference No.424 – Land West of canal, adj. Campions Wood Quarry

These sites were being monitored in the winter for flooding. What works will have to be carried out in order to make the ground safe? This site is an open quarry. Can you build this close to a quarry? Noise pollution.

4. Housing types

Too small a response to statistically measure.
5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

- Car Parking
- Environmental Improvements
- Shops and Retail

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

Cheslyn Hay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very low numbers contributing to the whole process

Attendance and Age Profile

Consultee Awareness

0-18 yrs
19-39 yrs
40-60 yrs
61+ yrs

Unaware of the whole process
Aware but had not contributed
Aware and already contributed

"We need more car parking especially around the school"
6. Overview from Community Council

Whilst every effort was made to secure a presence at a local event our discussions with the Parish Council determined that there were no suitable events taking place in the time period. At the suggestion of the council we established a drop in event which took place in late afternoon and early evening prior to the Parish Council Annual Meeting at the Community Centre. A comment was received which raised a query about whether the District Council should write consultee letters to those households neighbouring all the potential sites (as is the case with a planning application) to ensure that the people who are most effected are aware of the consultation process.

The event achieved a lower than anticipated turn out from the public and those that did attend were mainly 40-60 age range with some contribution from young people. The bulk of the attendees were not aware of the Local Plan Process and were pleased to be able to contribute to our event.

General comments were made over; a) potential increase in quarry activity including heavy vehicle traffic b) local school capacity and c) affordable housing.

In terms of community benefits, there appeared to be a general view that the village had adequate facilities although some did comment on the following; a) increased capacity at the school and b) increased parking provision in the village centre and at the school.

With regard to the potential sites there appeared to be an even view on whether development should take place on one site or a mix of smaller sites scattered across the village. Attendees consistently referred to flooding issues in relation to Sites 116, 118 and 424.

In terms of housing mix there were no great feelings expressed in this area other than a feeling that more affordable housing should be built for the benefit of young local people.
Site Allocations
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South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 4 – Central – Codsall

1. Potential community benefit

   - Housing Mix
     - Starter homes required
     - Dedicated older persons scheme like that in Essington

   - Car Parking
     - Railway station

   - GP Surgery, Chemist
     - Chapel Lane

   - Too small a plan on the website.

2. General comments

   Codsall could do with smaller properties being built for single, couples (young and old). Could do with a dedicated scheme for older people like SSHA have built in Essington and Cannock (shops, games room, rent, buy, part buy).

   As the old “Dowty” site is now vacant employment facilities moved and increased on I54 site – use this brownfield site for housing instead of taking over even more greenbelt. Maintain greenbelt.

3. Site specific references

   Site Reference No. 220 – Hollybush Lane/Oaken Lane, Codsall

   Land in Oaken Lanes opposite Station pub must be developed for car parking, urgent, say 50 or 60.

   Site Reference No.221 – Land at Dam Mill, Codsall

   Dam Mill – 221 – Access? Extremely dangerous stretch of road. Very anti! Need more facilities, parking at station, but sympathetic.
Site Reference No.222 – Land north of Sandy Lane, Codsall

Development in Sandy Lane, Codsall, okay. The large chestnut tree at the approach to the allotments must be retained.

Site Reference No.223 – Land at Watery Lane, Codsall

No comments.

Site Reference No.224 – Land adjacent 44 Station Road, Codsall

May be a good site but worried about traffic impact and safety through station Road and Oaken Lanes.

Site Reference No.225 – Land off Wood Road, Slate Lane, Codsall

No comments.

Site Reference No.228 – Adult Training Centre, off Histons Hill, Codsall

No comments.

Site Reference No.406 – Land at Keepers Lane and Nine Acres Farm, Codsall

419 – 406 Tend to flood. Access is very poor. Will create rat runs through the village. Histons Hill very busy traffic.

Site Reference No.419 – Land off Wergs Hall Road

419 – 406 Tend to flood. Access is very poor. Will create rat runs through the village. Histons Hill very busy traffic.

Site Reference No.425 – Land at Oaken Village, Codsall

No comments.

4. Housing types

Too small a response to statistically measure.
5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

- Car parking
- Sports & recreational facilities
- Housing mix

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

Codsall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very few numbers

Attendance and Age Profile

Codsall

- Attendee Estimate: 34
- Registration: 25

- 0-18 yrs
- 19-39 yrs
- 40-60 yrs
- 61+ yrs

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken as part of the Codsall Local History event which was held with the support of Staffordshire County Archives Service. This has traditionally been a well-attended event and this year was no exception with the event being held at Codsall Village Hall. The Parish Council was supportive of the work being undertaken however no councillors were thought to be present at the event.

Our stall was attended by a varied cross section of the community covering all age ranges and family mixes, many of whom had either not heard about the Local Plan Consultation Process or had not been able to attend the District Council event.

General comments related to; a) Increase in traffic that any new development would generate throughout the village but in particular along Histons Hill and b) the need for affordable housing. There was a general belief by a substantial number of people attending that the site off Watery Lane had already been earmarked for development (roundabout constructed many years ago ready to take the development of the site). Land to the west of Codsall was generally viewed as inappropriate for development.

There was little consensus in respect of Community Benefits but the following were highlighted; a) station car parking, b) dedicated older persons complex.

With regard to the potential sites it is difficult to draw too many conclusions from the event due to the limited numbers however sites 228 and 223 were the most favoured for development. A number of people raised the issue of flooding in respect of site 406 and 409 and access or dangerous roads were highlighted in respect of sites 221, 224, 406 and 409.

In addition one person suggested that the former Dowty site be used for residential use which was a brownfield site and this would help to retain green belt land.

In terms of housing mix the general feelings being expressed were that there needs to be more affordable housing.
Site Allocations
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South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 2 – North West – Coven

1. Potential community benefit

- Health
  - Need proper medical centre

- Burial Ground
  - Church needs more burial ground space

- Housing Mix
  - Need a “retirement village”
  - Need more smaller affordable homes

- Open Space
  - Communal area/village green

- Parking
  - Need more/better parking especially by the shops

- Other
  - Footpaths, bridleways

2. General comments

Coven - very busy lanes already and more housing will add to the dangers on the roads for children and elderly, especially up School Lane, which has heavy lorries using this narrow lane all day. Coven needs a proper medical centre, we are grateful for the Brewood doctors having their surgeries here now but need more. Church needs more burial land urgently.

We currently live in Featherstone with the wish to move to Coven, but find that there is a real lack of housing for families. I am in favour of areas being developed to increase the ‘community’, but of course keeping the lovely atmosphere of the village.

“Retirement village” not sheltered and warden controlled.

Complaint from bungalow owner, can’t sell house due to “converted bungalows” either side of her house. Roof space being converted to make them a house!
3. Site specific references

Site Reference No.080 – Land at Croft Garage, Brewood Road

Preferred option for part of scheme.

80 and 85 will bring too much traffic.

Site Reference No.082 - Land between A449 Stafford Road and School Lane

Could be used if can access from A449. Concern over level of traffic arising from JLR factory coming up Lawn Lane, before any new houses are built.

Site Reference No.084 – Land adjoining Star Mobile Home Park

100 and 84 will allow access away from village centre.

Site Reference No.085 – Land at Grange Farm

Least preferred as this area is a communal area for the village.

80 and 85 will bring too much traffic.

85 is part of public space used by the public to walk through to the village centre and keeps children away from the road, building would affect this green belt and affect nature that has been there for over 35 years. It would be preferable to not having new housing as it is a village, not a town. We need to keep our green land and nature. Concern is in the main with reference to traffic through the village as the village is a major thoroughfare to Brewood and BishopsWood. Also parking at local shops is already a problem. Playing fields need regeneration.

Site Reference No.086 - Land at School Lane

School Lane, Coven - With the extra traffic being generated by the new prison, the new incinerator and the dustbin wagons; being in a radius of less than 3 miles, we now have large numbers of incoming people from the new JLR factory. All of which is creating congestion within the village at Coven. Lawn Lane will become a main thoroughfare to avoid the A449 from the Wobastion Road to the Harrows Pub. This is now a very busy route. My feeling is that more housing means even more traffic.

Smaller more affordable homes needed. School Lane is a rat run, too much traffic so no development off School Lane. Need homes for young families that are affordable. Older people in large houses need places to trade down to.

School Lane - Please no more traffic. It is now being used as a rat run to the new recycling plant and the school traffic is already causing a problem. Consider the danger to children.
going to the field if another road junction is made. I live in School Lane and I already worry about the children constantly riding scooters and bicycles with very little road sense.

Site Reference No. 087 – Land at Stadacona, Stafford Road

Second option.

Site Reference No. 100 – Land west of the A449

Access from A449 would be beneficial.

100 and 84 will allow access away from village centre.

Site 100 withdrawn.

Behind church - poor access - close to burial/church site/brook/River Penk. Volume of traffic. Village school would not cope with influx of children already turn away village children. Coven can already become congested. Lawn Lane – “Rat Run” people cutting through village.

4. Housing types

![Housing types chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Town house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sheltered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Bungalow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bungalows were consistently popular, which may be down to the age range of those participating although in general terms the population does favour bungalows. In those areas where people expressed a view about affordable housing it scored very high. Detached houses were also popular which again may be explained by the desire factor rather than what the community need.

*Some respondents may have used this process to express their personal need/desire for a particular house type.
5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

- Road improvements
- Play space & equipment
- GP, surgery, chemist

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coven</th>
<th>Attendee Estimate</th>
<th>Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance and Age Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coven</th>
<th>Attendee Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation took place in the afternoon and early evening with a drop in event being held at Coven Memorial Hall with the support and attendance of the Parish Council.

The majority of those attending the event had either not heard of or taken part in the Local Plan Consultation Process before. Most had heard of this event via the A Boards and banners. The age profile of those attending was generally middle aged / older people although a number of younger parents attended when picking the children up from school.

General comments related to; a) Increase in traffic and b) a better mix of housing. With regard to traffic there were a number of people that highlighted the dangerous situation of traffic using School Lane and Lawn Lane as a “rat run” with people choosing this route as an alternative to the A449 traveling north to south and south to north. More development in the village would increase this problem. In addition three was a lot of concern expressed over the number of lorries passing through the village form the incinerator plant.

In relation to Community Benefits there was no majority view but some highlighted the following; a) better mix of house types, b) need for a medical centre as opposed to a visiting surgery, c) village green and d) extension to burial ground.

With regard to the potential sites there was little consensus on the favoured site but there was a majority of people that felt that site 85 was most unsuitable. Sites 80, 87 and 100 were most favoured for development.

In terms of housing mix the general feelings being expressed were that there needs to be more bungalows provided in the village and the recurring theme of older people in large houses wanting the trade down was mentioned on numerous occasions.
Essington

Consultation not required
Community Council of Staffordshire

South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 3 – North East – Featherstone

1. Potential community benefit

- Sports and Recreation
  - Skate Park on 168
  - More play spaces and sport facilities

- Housing Mix
  - Need more affordable and smaller houses for young people

- School
  - Will need extra school places.

2. General comments

Need more social housing/affordable housing.

Prefer no more housing in the village, had plenty over the years. Featherstone no longer a village. Was asked some time ago if the community wanted a prison or houses - community opted for prison and they thought they would not get any more houses.

Any housing should be affordable to the young of the village and smaller dwellings - bungalows for villagers to downsize and release family homes.

If new houses come we might need new school. More things for children.

Could do with SSHA 4/5 bedroom houses.

Need more affordable homes, private for sale not more social housing.
3. Site specific references

Site Reference No.167 – Land to the rear of the Red, White and Blue
No comments.

Site Reference No.168 – Brinsford Lodge

Skate park needed on site 168

168 and 397. Access very poor down the existing lane. Land to the north of New Road has good access and wouldn’t impact too much.

168 and 397 for play spaces and sports facilities.

Site Reference No.169 – Featherstone Hall Farm, New Road

Site 169 for allotments. It will also improve connections between Featherstone and Brinsford.

Site Reference No.170 – Land east of Brookhouse Lane

No comments.

Site Reference No. 171 – Land fronting Cannock Road and New Road

Not 171, 395 or 433.

The stretch of new road adjacent to 171/395/433 is currently a 40mph zone - this will need to be adjusted to 30mph with traffic calming.

Site Reference No.172 – Land at Cannock Road

Get rid of the car boot sale and traffic issues.

Traffic congestion already too much from boot sale at the moment. Access not likely from main road, will use Dark Lane. Dark Lane used as a ‘rat run’.

Site reference No. 395 – Land off New Road

Not 171, 395 or 433.

The stretch of new road adjacent to 171/395/433 is currently a 40mph zone - this will need to be adjusted to 30mph with traffic calming.
**Site Reference No. 396 – Land off New Road/East Road**

I think that housing would be better suited on site 396 to balance everything out.

**Site Reference No. 397 – Land adjacent to Brinsford Lodge**

168 and 397. Access very poor down the existing lane. Land to the north of New Road has good access and wouldn’t impact too much.

168 and 397 for play spaces and sports facilities.

Featherstone Brinsford Lodge which really should be kept in the village for recreational purposes as it has such a history - such a part of the liaison between Malaysia/Featherstone, which is still very active.

**Site Reference No. 433 – Land at New Road/Featherstone Lane**

Not 171, 395 or 433.

The stretch of new road adjacent to 171/395/433 is currently a 40mph zone - this will need to be adjusted to 30mph with traffic calming.

**4. Housing types**

Too small a response to statistically measure.
5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

- Sports and recreational facilities
- Play space and equipment
- Allotments

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

### Featherstone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397/168</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance and Age Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Featherstone</th>
<th>Attendee Estimate</th>
<th>Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed

November 2014 • Featherstone
6. Overview from Community Council

It was proposed by the Community Council with agreement from the Parish Council to access as many youngsters as possible including parents by holding the Consultation Event at the Picnic in the Park on a summer Sunday afternoon held at Featherstone Community Centre.

The event was very popular and the age range of visitors was very diverse during the afternoon whilst the weather held out 2pm to 6pm.

The Parish Council was keen to become involved with the consultation and thought it important for the community to have their say on the future housing developments by offering the Community Council a stand at the very popular event.

Residents gave a generally accepted view that development to the north and west of the village were more acceptable. There was mixed view on site no. 167 as to whether development was preferred. The potential capacity for this site though is limited to 4-7 units.

From the community benefit angle sports facilities and play spaces and equipment were the most popular requests made by residents closely followed by the provision of a swimming pool and then allotments for the young people to get involved in growing and understanding seasonality of vegetables and fruit.

Site no. 168 was considered to be most suitable area for the location of a skate park.

There was a concern that the existing capacity at the local schools would need to be increased. In terms of housing mix it was suggested that more affordable and smaller houses for young people would enable families to reside in the area within which they grew up.

One resident believed allotments should be allocated to site no. 168 Brinsford Lodge should be retained for recreational use particularly as it has historical Malaysian connections.

In the event of site no.s 171 395 or 433 being allocated for housing, the main thoroughfare would need to have restricted speed limit of 30mph down from current 40mph.
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South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 3 – North East – Great Wyrley

1. Potential community benefit

• GP Surgery, Chemist
  – Update the GP surgery

2. General comments

Parish Councillor Albert Clarke told us that the parish had recently completed an exercise to identify all the land owned by the parish. He wondered if the council would find it useful.

The council need to use more greenland for development – need to attract more young people

The drainage needs updating to make it adequate for the housing already in the area – Caddick Farm Estate.

We are in need of a house, so there should be more houses to be built in the area, so families like us can find a house.

I don’t want any houses built in this area unless I know who they will be for.

More money spent on updating services that people need. Health Centre needs more staff and more updated building – has large number of elderly disabled people.

As for development – need amenities for the residents we already have, who have very small amount.

3. Site specific references

Site Reference No. 134 – Home Farm, Walsall Road/Jacobs Hall Lane

No comments.

Site Reference No. 136 – South of Upper Landywood Lane (north)

Mineshafts signs on site.

Public park running across the site is fenced off due to mineshafts.
136 & 137 – Houses on this site is essential. Previous objections to planning on this site for reasons of village integration is stupid. The roads will still divide the villages of Cheslyn Hay and Great Wyrley. I live in Lingfield Drive and only the railway divides that street from Cheslyn Hay.

Site Reference No.137 – South of Upper Landywood Lane (south)

136 & 137 – Houses on this site is essential. Previous objections to planning on this site for reasons of village integration is stupid. The roads will still divide the villages of Cheslyn Hay and Great Wyrley. I live in Lingfield Drive and only the railway divides that street from Cheslyn Hay.

Site Reference No.138 – Leacroft Lane/Roman View

No comments.

Site Reference No.139 – Pool View, Churchbridge

No comments.

Site Reference No.141 – 154a Walsall Road

No comments.

Site Reference No.145 – Land south of M6 TOLL at Churchbridge

No comments.

Site Reference No.440 – Land east of Love Lane

No comments

Site Reference No.441 – Land north of Hazel Lane

No comments

4. Housing types

Too small a response to statistically measure.
5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

- Road Improvements
- Village Centre Improvements
- Community Building

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

Great Wyrley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very few numbers

Attendance and Age Profile

Great Wyrley

Attendee Estimate 39
Registration 35

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed
6. Overview from Community Council

The Community Council requested permission to attend the local Annual Carnival but the organisers would not allow access to the event.

The consultation was held outside the Co-op Foodstore in Wardles Lane on a Friday during the hours of 10am until 3pm when foot traffic was highest for the store.

The Parish Council was approached to promote the event and A boards and Banners were erected by the Community Council around the village on the day. The stand was positioned outside of the main entrance to the store catching people as they entered and departed with their shopping.

It was a dry day and that encouraged residents to stop and complete a comments sheet and to view the variation of sites available for consideration.

One Parish Councillor attended the stand and expressed the need for the village to attract more young people and families.

One resident had no objection to homes being built if they were designed for families and affordable for single parent families to occupy.

It was generally felt that the GP facility was inadequate for the current size of the village with poor provision for disabled patients and a new building and more staff were required to satisfy residents demand created by the new homes. Other community improvements proposed were road infrastructure, schools, shops, drainage and the retention of the existing Day Care facilities.

Starter homes and flats were the preferred housing type for new builds in the area. Site No. 138 had very few objections together with Nos 440 and 141 as the most preferred sites for housing. There was a strong objection to Site Nos 137 and 136 claiming that mineshaft danger signs indicated its unsuitability for development. There was a tendency for more people to be against houses being built on site 134 than for the development at Jacobs Hall Lane.

There was a general concern about the independence of Great Wyrley and Cheslyn Hay being lost as empty spaces separating the two villages become developed with urban spread.
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South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 1 – North – Huntington

1. Potential community benefit

- Community Facilities
  - Need a coffee shop/café
  - Need more shops

- Transport
  - Need better / cheaper bus service

- Road Improvements

- Sports Facilities

- Play Spaces

- Allotments

- Environmental Improvements

- Swimming Pool

- Village Centre Improvements

- Shops and retail

- Support for Community Groups

2. General comments

Need room for a coffee shop/café and/or other small business opportunities.

No housing developments behind the monkey row terraces, this land would be better utilised as allotments as there are no facilities of this kind in the village at all.
Before any more housing developments are built, a serious consideration of the village facilities is required. The current shops are insufficient as it is and more housing would only exacerbate the situation.

Needs more facilities with expansion of housing.

3. Site specific references

- **Site Reference No.012 – Land at Oaklands Farm**
  
  No comments

- **Site Reference No.013 – Land at Oaklands Farm – Site 1**
  
  No comments

- **Site Reference No.014 – Land at Oaklands Farm – Site 2**
  
  No comments

- **Site Reference No.015 – Land at Oaklands Farm – Site 3**
  
  No comments

- **Site Reference No.016 – Pear Tree Farm**
  
  No comments

- **Site Reference No.017 – Land off Dogintree Estate – of Almond Road**
  
  No comments

4. Housing types

Too small a response to statistically measure.
5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’
- Shops and retail
- Employment
- Allotments

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance and Age Profile

Consultee Awareness

Unaware of the whole process
Aware but had not contributed
Aware and already contributed
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken as part of the Huntington Fete, a relatively new event that takes place on the Village Green in the centre of the village. The event took place in the afternoon and early evening. It was supported by the parish council with a number of councillors on hand to support the process.

Our stall was attended by a varied cross section of the community but with quite a lot of young families who arrived after collecting their children from the local school. Very few of those who gave comments were aware of the Local Plan Consultation Process.

In terms of general comments there were a considerable number of people who were under the impression that a number of the sites identified and others not identified, had already received planning consent. This did lead to a general mistrust in the process. In addition to this people raised the issue of poor and expensive transport into Cannock, the main centre for facilities. There were some comments about the need for more shops and better facilities in general in the village which would also have the effect of reducing the need to travel to Cannock.

With regard to Community Benefits, there was a high preference for: a) allotments, b) sports facilities and play spaces (including a swimming pool) and c) support for community groups.

Sites 12, 14 and 16 were the most favoured sites for development with sites 15 and 17 being the least favoured for development. There was very little contribution in respect of reasons for particular site being chosen.
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South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 5 – South – Kinver

1. Potential community benefit

- Sports and Recreational Facilities
  - need generally more but in particular tennis and bowls
  - Could do with a swimming pool and better facilities

- Health
  - We might need a bigger health centre

- School
  - School needs investment in infrastructure

- Young People
  - Facilities for teenagers

- Housing Mix
  - Need for housing for the elderly

- Road Improvements
  - Potters Cross road junction needs desperately to be improved

- Other
  - Retaining greenbelt land.

- There are no benefits
  - Kinver has had sufficient infill over the years. Doctor’s surgery and school not big enough for more. Staffordshire NHS offers insufficient service to Kinver.

2. General comments

Spread housing around various sites.

Ex British Legion premises latest application for housing. Site in flood plain and in greenbelt. Children’s nursery consent runs out in 2015.
Accommodation for elderly/retiring population would be preferable and attract the least objections.

Too much building on back gardens need to go into Green Belt.

Need to build on back gardens to not lose Green Belt.

Complete new village 1000 units - size of one new village. Consolidate investment into one village with better facilities, would be cost effective - 16 villages might be happier not spoiling existing villages through development.

Need to protect Kinver Rock Houses views.

New gas supply recently installed has a smaller diameter than previous one.

Meddins Lane should read Jewkes Avenue.

3. Site specific references

**Site Reference No.270 – Land off Hyde Lane (east)**

i) Site floods, now that stream has been blocked by local resident flooding restricted to field adjacent.

ii) Extra traffic along extra busy road posing an extra danger to residents.

iii) Speed limit along Hyde Lane no longer obeyed by majority of motorists especially since alterations to village speed restrictions.

iv) All roads verge on Potters Cross - danger to schools, playschools etc.

270 - does not now flood and had been sealed off by landowner (also parish councillor), but land north of Hyde Lane is now like a lake, not good for planning.

Floods, part of flood plain.

270/271/272 – Preferred sites - no need to go through Potters Cross.

**Site Reference No.271 – Land off Hyde Lane (west)**

270/271/272 – Preferred sites - no need to go through Potters Cross.

This has wide grass verges which would allow for new pavements to improve access.

**Site Reference No.272 – Land East of Dunsley Drive**

270/271/272 – Preferred sites - no need to go through Potters Cross.
Site Reference No.273 – North of White Hill

How will you have vehicle access? Road too narrow for cars to pass each other, no pavement on either side. Steep banks no way of widening road. Where will you run storm drains and sewage? Storm drains from Edgeview Road/Huntsmans Drive lifted in our garden on 09/06/14 again!

Having lived at the top of White Hill for more than 20 years, we have seen the problems caused by traffic passing through a road barely wider than single track. It would be impossible to provide a bus service to this site, making it unsuitable for the provision of homes for elderly people. The steep hill would make it unsuitable for them to walk, or young families with pushchairs. In winter the road is treacherous and un-gritted, so it is only possible with 4x4 vehicles.

Edge View Walk cul-de-sac off could be accessible.

274a, 274b and 273 – traffic Potters Cross road junction cannot take extra traffic, particularly at school drop off and collection times.

No footpath, White Hill.

Potters Cross congested - 273 and 274a not a good site due to narrow single track access. Children, shops, schools cause lot of the congestion. Road to White Hill single track access.

273/274a/274b – Crown Estates land unlikely to be released before 2030.

Site Reference No.274a – Land south of White Hill (a)

274a, 274b and 273 – traffic Potters Cross road junction cannot take extra traffic, particularly at school drop off and collection times.

274a and 274b – organic, no pesticides - Staffs Way.

Potters Cross congested - 273 and 274a not a good site due to narrow single track access. Children, shops, schools cause lot of the congestion. Road to White Hill single track access.

273/274a/274b – Crown Estates land unlikely to be released before 2030.

274a Not considered appropriate at the Staffordshire Way goes through this site.

Site Reference No.274b – Land south of White Hill (b)

274a, 274b and 273 – traffic Potters Cross road junction cannot take extra traffic, particularly at school drop off and collection times.

274a and 274b – organic, no pesticides - Staffs Way

273/274a/274b – Crown Estates land unlikely to be released before 2030.
4. Housing types

We badly need affordable housing.

Desperate for affordable homes. Family moved away because they couldn’t afford to buy, would love to come back to Kinver to be near mom and dad.

Need more affordable housing.

5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

• Swimming pool
• Housing mix
• Sports & recreational facilities

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

Kinver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key

2  Flat
6  Town house
26  Affordable housing
19  Sheltered
15  Semi-detached
13  Detached
19  Bungalow

Total number of responses: 47

Attendance and Age Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendee Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed

Bungalows were consistently popular, which may be down to the age range of those participating although in general terms the population does favour bungalows. In those areas where people expressed a view about affordable housing it scored very high. Detached houses were also popular which again may be explained by the desire factor rather than what the community need.

*Some respondents may have used this process to express their personal need/ desire for a particular house type.
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken as part of the very popular and well attended Kinver Country Fayre. A day long outdoors event that took place throughout the village. The Parish Council felt that they should not be party to the consultation for various reasons.

Our stall was attended by a varied cross section of the community with predominance towards middle aged people. The vast majority of people attending had either not heard about the Local Plan Consultation Process or had not been able to attend the District Council event.

In terms of general comments these related to; a) most people felt that Kinver was becoming too big and losing its village feel and b) concerns about the increase in traffic. Access to most of the sites was a problem with existing roads being very small and some not having pavements. In addition there was concern about traffic moving towards Wolverhampton/West Midlands and this influenced the view that the sites to the north of Kinver would be better.

In terms of Community Benefits there was a preference for new/improved sports and recreational facilities, facilities for young people and general investment in health and schools. The issue of improved road junction at Potters Cross was raised on numerous occasions.

With regard to the potential sites, site 270, 271 and 272 were the most favoured for development with 274a, 274b and 409 being the least favoured sites. In terms of specific issues related to sites, problems associated with Potters Cross junction and traffic were highlighted in respect of most sites with the exception of 409 and flooding was cited as an issue in respect of 270.

In terms of housing mix the general feelings being expressed were that there needs to be more affordable housing, sheltered housing and bungalows.
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South Staffordshire Site Allocations
Locality 4 – Central – Pattingham

1. Potential community benefit

• GP Surgery
  – A must
  – Field on right Chesterton Road/West End

2. General comments

Clive Road and main road through the village - traffic calming measures. Traffic calming measures are urgently required in the village before a child is seriously hurt or more tragically killed. Clive Road speed limit 30mph, but most cars travel at 40mph to 60mph. Also large wagons use the lane as a cut through from the Bridgnorth Road, they ignore the signs. Urgent action is required before any new housing developments.

No more building on the greenbelt or within the village.

Pigot Arms car park brownfield site - proposal.

No. 7 Wolverhampton Road = BT Exchange. GP Surgery for sale potential.

It may be 3 houses now, but I feel once a site is built upon it will expand and expand. All the village roads are not big enough for more growth. The sewerage plant is not big enough. Roads already flood in places. The school wouldn’t be big enough. The bus service is abysmal and I’ve heard a friend say there are times they do not turn up so more cars are used. More houses = more cars = roads too small. Prime farmland should NOT be built on ever! This country need to protect its food production. Green belts were made for a very good reason.

Taken 20 years to afford to live here.

Would like bungalows.

Single people need to come into the area.

Dick Law’s field should accommodate 19 houses.
3. Site specific references

Site Reference No. 249 – Land adjacent to Meadowside off High Street

Pattingham Doctors’ Surgery - Best site is off Chesterton Road (land 249 or 401) or off Wolverhampton Road (253). Other sites would all create too much traffic (eg 251, 252, 421) through residential area.

2 residents proposed this safeguarded land.

1 resident suggested GP surgery should be located on site 249.

Site Reference No. 250 – Land off Patshull Road

253 and 250 better sites from traffic point of view.

Site Reference No. 251 – Hall End Farm

No comments.

Site Reference No. 252 – Land at Clive Road

East of Clive Road better for houses. Clive Road speed restrictions required.

Identified by 1 resident as safeguarded land.

Rear footpath uncultivated small square of land with access for up to 6 units.

Site Reference No. 253 – Land off Westbeech Road

253 and 250 better sites from traffic point of view.

Site Reference No. 401 – Land adjacent to Beech House Farm

Pattingham Doctors’ Surgery - Best site is off Chesterton Road (land 249 or 401) or off Wolverhampton Road (253). Other sites would all create too much traffic (eg 251, 252, 421) through residential area.

Site Reference No. 421 – Land between Rudge Road and Marlbrook Lane

No comments.
4. Housing types

Bungalows were consistently popular, which may be down to the age range of those participating although in general terms the population does favour bungalows. In those areas where people expressed a view about affordable housing it scored very high. Detached houses were also popular which again may be explained by the desire factor rather than what the community need.

5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

- GP surgery, chemist
- Pub
- Sports and recreational facilities

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance and Age Profile

Pattingham

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Estimate</th>
<th>Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken as part of Pattingham Church Fete, an outdoor event that took place in the afternoon in the village.

Our stall was attended by a varied cross section of the community covering all age ranges and family mixes, but with predominance towards younger families the majority of which had heard about the Local Plan Consultation Process and had contributed to the process.

The overriding general comments being made by those that attended our stall related to the; a) existing poor road system in the village and b) resist development and preservation of green belt.

In terms of Community Benefits, these predominately related to a need for highway improvements/speed control and the requirement for a GP Surgery.

With regard to the potential sites, 421, 252 and 253 were the most favoured with 249 and 251 being the least favoured.

Sites 251, 252, 421 identified as having issues related to traffic/access but little comment on other sites.

Site 249 was particularly referred to as being most appropriate location for GP surgery and 2 residents believed that the site should be safeguarded for future development beyond 2028. Site 252 was also recommended for allocation into the safeguarding category by one resident.

In terms of housing mix the general feelings being expressed were that there needs to be more affordable housing and bungalows.
Site Allocations

Pattingham

November 2014
Community Council of Staffordshire
Pattingham

Site Allocations
Community Council of Staffordshire

South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 1 – North – Penkridge

1. Potential community benefit

• Car Parking
  – except it would be used for people travelling in to use the railway station as they do now.

• GP Surgery, Chemist
  – Bigger GP surgery, bigger shop
  – Excellent, but should be respected and supported

• Shops and Retail
  – more shops
  – supermarket

• Other
  – Open up the disused railway for walking/cycling to link up to Huntington to Cannock Chase. Improve cycle path along A449 from junction 13 to Gailey. Need to take out kerbs as can’t cycle up and down kerbs without damaging your bike. Hedges etc. need trimming back in places to pass. Some of the path is that bad you need a mountain bike.
  – New hotel, wider variety of retail options

2. General comments

No more houses by motorway – not healthy.

Affordable housing/starter homes for the younger residents. Having to leave the village as the housing is not affordable.

Transport is poor for those who can’t drive. One bus an hour into Stafford/Wolverhampton and sometimes they don’t turn up. Did have a taxi firm that did journeys around village but now gone.

Need affordable housing to bring more younger people into the area, which in time will boost income and revenue within Penkridge.

More people need more doctors and schools.

“...We need affordable housing/starter homes for the younger residents…”
Affordable housing is needed.

We moved here 14 years ago to a village that had all facilities for modern life but still had the village charm. I am sure people are turning in their graves because of all the development that is planned. We are in danger of losing the village feel.

Penkridge Middle School - looking for advice on number of houses to plan spaces.

This village does NOT need new housing.

If more housing then transport needs to be more reliable and frequent.

Market Street to be pedestrianised.

3. Site specific references

Site Reference No. 001 – Lyne Hill Industrial Estate

I live on Manston Hill and worry about access to the new housing site of approx. 300 homes (001/006).

Access to Otherton Lane, not a good idea. Site 001 – Will the sewerage system handle the extra loading?

Near to local amenities, school, shops etc.

Concerned about the build up of traffic on A449 for entry and exit onto 001 site. Also pedestrians crossing A449 by garage and 001 site.

Lyne Hill – too dense housing - not enough community/possibly planned on site. The site at Lyne Hill 001 should have part allocated for employment in preference to 004.

The site is an eyesore due to the demolition of existing factories therefore building on this site would eliminate this. We need to think of the elderly people who have lived here all their life, building another residential home, e.g. Pencric. We need starter homes for the younger generation.

001/006 – Not clear about access issues.

001 and 006 - Concerns re. demolition on land adjoining Boscomoor Lane and access for vehicles going into and out of housing area. This is particularly noteworthy due to nearby Little Treasures Day Nursery and vehicles on narrow lanes next to nursery. Already existing problem of volume and speed of traffic. What’s the future with all the extra vehicles? Traffic and risk to pedestrians and cycles on narrow roads.
The prospect of potentially 900 people residing here will be a huge problem putting additional pressure on medical practice and schools. Also, the congestion or traffic on Wolgarston Way.

If we need more housing in the village, rather than use green land, this would be an ideal place as this has already been used for building. However, I think a lot of consideration is needed as to what type of housing is put there. We need to attract young couples so we have pupils for the schools but also another independent living area similar to Pencric, but no higher than two story. No larger houses are needed as we have these covered. I also think we need to think traditional rather than too modern.

**Site Reference No.003 – Land adjacent to Bridge House Hotel**

Flood land

Used to work at Bridge House and car park floods.

No flood plain and car parking.

The ‘Bridge site’ (Bulbridge) is recently enlarged for our parking. This is important for the village and should be retained.

**Site Reference No.004 – Land north of Penkridge of A449 (west)**

Good for future development as still near to local amenities and shops.

Mixed housing – no employment.

Floods.

**Site Reference No. 005 – Land off Cherrybrook Drive**

005 – This land is very close to the motorway and is very noisy.

005 – Yes, I agree mixed housing.

**Site Reference No. 006 – Land off Boscomoor Lane**

Road Improvements? My front door is on Boscomoor/Wolgarston Way and have to park in a layby. How would island improve things. How close to my front door?

I live on Manston Hill and worry about access to the new housing site of approx. 300 homes (001/006).

Flood land.

Yes, housing and community use.

With all these proposals this village will no longer have a village feel. The road systems cannot cope
with further traffic. The environmental issues will be immense. Conservation will be affected. The village will look like a concrete jungle with a lack of greenery which will affect the carbon footprint of the village. The schools are unable to cope with the amount of children which means bigger classes and therefore a lack of learning. I totally oppose all proposed sites but particularly 006 which will affect nature and the canal. All sites will cause congestion. I will also be affected by 006 by a loss of light due to these new houses. I will see a lack of trees and nature.

001/006 – Not clear about access issues.

001 and 006 - Concerns re. demolition on land adjoining Boscomoor Lane and access for vehicles going into and out of housing area. This is particularly noteworthy due to nearby Little Treasures Day Nursery and vehicles on narrow lanes next to nursery. Already existing problem of volume and speed of traffic. What’s the future with all the extra vehicles? Traffic and risk to pedestrians and cycles on narrow roads.

Site Reference No.420 – Land east of A449

No to housing too near the river.

Site Reference No.430 – Land off Lyne Hill Lane/A449

No.

4. Housing types

Too small a response to statistically measure.
5. Facilitator's report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

- Road improvements
- Shops & retail
- GP surgery & chemist

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

Penkridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance and Age Profile

- Penkridge
  - Attendee Estimate: 52
  - Registration: 41

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed
The consultation was undertaken as part of the “Let’s Celebrate Penkridge” event which was a wide ranging all day community gathering held at the Haling Dene Centre. The event was supported by the Parish Council.

Our stall was attended by a varied cross section of the community covering all age ranges and family mixes. The vast majority had either not heard about the Local Plan Consultation Process or had not been able to attend the District Council event.

In terms of general comments residents raised concerns about a) over development of the village, b) a need for affordable houses; c) need to expand GP services and schools and d) traffic and poor transport. There was considerable confusion over the current planning situation with regard to Lyne Hill Industrial Estate with conflicting views being expressed.

In terms of community benefits, people highlighted the need for a) an expansion to the GP Surgery, b) more shops and c) the potential of opening the disused railway line for walking/cycling.

With regard to the potential sites, 1, 4 and 5 were the most favoured with sites 3, 420 and 430 least favoured.

With regard to specific comments on sites residents highlighted those sites 3, 4 and 6 have a history of flooding and a considerable amount of concern was raised with regard to the loss of car parking at the Bridge Inn.

In terms of housing mix the general feelings being expressed were that there needs to be more affordable housing.
I. Potential community benefit

- Sports and recreation
  - yes nothing for adults and children.

- Housing Mix
  - more 4 bedroom houses, we are now overcrowded and need a 4 bedroom house on council estate.
  - bungalows.
  - social housing.

- Road and highway improvements
  - Access on and off estate.
  - Access for cars to Yew Tree Lane from Perton.
  - Access from Yew Tree Lane.
  - To accommodate new housing only.
  - Additional route onto/off Perton.
  - Especially Heath House Lane.
  - Many potholes.
  - Most important.
  - Perton-Wolverhampton in rush hour (40 mins?!).
  - More ‘sleeping policemen’ in certain road.
  - The promised exits from Perton – open bus lane, return of bus service.
  - Get rid of left turn from Wrottesley Road and Pattingham Road.
  - We are still without a passing bus service.
  - Put bus route back to original way around Parkway.
  - Access and exits need to be vastly improved.
  - High school, to save travelling for pupils.
  - High school to stop children travelling to Codsdall.
  - Street parking is a nightmare.
  - Traffic is a problem now and will be a real issue for residents if nothing done.
  - Only 2 ways off Perton, nightmare.

- Car parking
  - for local schools.
We need indoor facilities for our young generation

- Environmental improvements
  - land drainage (around lakes in particular).

- Schools
  - Educational provision at secondary level. Not physical building but an end to charging for transportation to Codsall.
  - High school.
  - Schools facilities for young people.
  - If more houses are going to be build need for more schools as already over-crowded.
  - High school.
  - New schools.
  - With new building planned schools!! Pound to a penny current schools will not cope.
  - High School.

- GP Surgery, Chemist
  - and dentist, only one at present

- Village centre improvements
  - walkways to be resurfaced, some not accessible to the disabled.

- Swimming pool sports and recreation
  - yes nothing for adults and children.
  - have nothing for older children and our children could have swimming lessons in school time, which they need living next to a lake.
  - Codsall not easily/safely accessible on foot.
  - not any good for babies as too cold as a sports pool.

- Support setting up community groups
  - We have many.

- Pub
  - No, we have two already.

- Shops and retail
  - within new development.
  - Lidl or Aldi.
  - Yes, more clothes shops for children’s clothes.

- Employment opportunities
  - small scale business units.

- Other
  - Green belt.

- A number of the plans on display were impossible to interpret.

- All sites outside current development boundary.
• The duty to co-operate as specified under legislation needs to be borne in mind given the potential i.e. absence between Perton/Wightwick and Perton/Tettenhall on some sites.

• Many presenters of the developers teams had no knowledge of Perton at all.

• Site 239 is preferable to other options but would require public transport infrastructure. Also committed sums for youth provision should not be accepted unless developer provides land off site.
  – The promised exits from Perton – open bus lane, return of bus service.
  – Perton is currently great for young families and the more mature residents. Unless more facilities are made available for those in their 20s/30s, those who fall within that age group are not likely to purchase new houses in the area.
  – Real need to consider traffic access improvements.
  – Turn Smiths Rough and adjoining farmland into a country park. Get rid of left turn from Wrottesley Road and Pattingham Road.
  – Educational provision at secondary level. Not physical building but an end to charging for transportation to Codsall.
  – High school.
  – we are still without a passing bus service.
  – Policing.
  – New cycleways away from the road incorporating footpaths. Needs safe cycle/footpath to Codsall High.
  – more policing.
  – schools facilities for young people.
  – If more houses are going to be build need for more schools as already over-crowded.
  – High school.
  – Just want a good place to live with community spirit and facilities to provide this.
  – Any development should be within current village boundaries and not detached by existing roadways.
  – Put bus route back to original way around Parkway.
  – Village green.
  – new schools.
  – Would love to be able to own my own house, as we rent at present. Would hope that private landlords would not buy all houses and rent out!
  – Services and activities for young people.
  – Access and exits need to be vastly improved.
  – High school, to save travelling for pupils.
  – High school to stop children travelling to Codsall.
  – We need indoor facilities for our young generation
  – Street parking is a nightmare.
  – With new building planned schools!! Pound to a penny current schools will not cope. – Traffic is a problem now and will be a real issue for residents if nothing done. Only 2 ways off Perton, nightmare.
  – more 4 bedroom houses for families on council list.
  – more 4 bedroom houses for people like my daughter.
  – I have lived here for 37 years and fought and worked for most of the amenities we now have.
  – High School.
2. General comments

Need more 4 bedroom houses.

More facilities for children (young and older).

Need swimming pool so that children can take swimming lessons in school which is ideal when living next to a lake.

If and when building the houses should be given to local people first and not people from Wolverhampton.

I am on the SSHA list (which have been 5 years waiting for a 4 bedroom house) due to we are very overcrowded in our house, there are 2 adults and 4 children in a 3 bedroom house where my 3 daughters are in one room sharing bunk beds and my youngest is in a pull-out bed. We all share one bathroom/toilet. We have had to cope with this for 5 years due to no 4 bedroom house coming up on the list. I have lived in Perton for 32 years.

Please develop anywhere off Wrottesley Park Road and not anywhere else. Keep all development in one place.

No to any houses being built. Traffic is already too busy of a morning. The state of the village would be affected forever spoiling trees and wildlife.

Need to consider access in and out of Perton with the increase of housing and population. It is difficult already when one exit off Perton can’t be used. Also, we feel the houses need to be affordable for young families too.

Against build at Perton. Already oversubscribed admissions. Waiting time for doctors. Traffic on and off Perton.

Perton is as of now a nice place to live. My main concern is who is going to live here, immigrants etc.? As we at Perton are the lowest form of life in S. Staffs., the likes of Kinver, Pattingham, Codsall, Brewood etc, would make sure we have any rubbish!

There are better options on the A41 junction. The increase in environmental noise and pollution and traffic will not benefit the community and children of Perton.

5 out of 6 sites represent a potential gross over-development with many promises made which are highly likely to be undelivered in terms of community benefit. Certain sites also threaten coalescence with Wolverhampton – either at Wightwick or Tettenahll.

Very little thought has been given to existing services and facilities. Some sites make it virtually impossible to reach the centre by foot. The schools and doctors facilities would need drastic improvement.
Was told no surveys had been conducted, however knew about trees, bats etc. Need to get information right before being able to talk to public!

Either sites 246a, 407, 239, 238a or 402. Perton needs to retain its green spaces so I believe expansion needs to be outside its current boundaries.

Please consider sport facilities for females as already have football pitches, eg tennis/netball and for elderly eg, boule or bowls. Cycle paths. Prefer site nearer to traffic lights near Bradshaw’s as considered open spaces and traffic congestion, other sites do not consider highway.

I feel your red and green stickers are a very juvenile exercise. Hasn’t anyone noticed that everyone puts a red spot nearest their home and a green spot anywhere else? I have lived here since 1977 and feel part of a good community. Don’t cram too much in!

Traffic – Perton to Codsall and motorways, Heath House Lane needs widening to proper road – safety of cycles and children walking to High School.

It is more useful to use land west of W rottesley Park Road, any of the 3 sites.

166 houses = 300 extra cars. 800 extra people. All sites - these houses are going to be built whether we like it or not but the following needs to be taken into consideration:
- Road access: getting on/off the estate at rush hour is a nightmare - how will builders be able to address/ease this issue. Only 1 site is able to address this issue from plans seen today.
- Schools: existing nursery/primary/middle schools do not have capacity. Codsall also has another 260 houses being built meaning the high school will have to accommodate 420 houses worth of children.
- Medical care: called today to book a doctor’s appointment – 5 days wait! That will only get worse
- Housing mix/social housing: the argument being used is it will help local residents get on the property ladder - how? Will they get “pushed up” housing lists? Will landlords buying housing stock to rent out? Will people buying the starter homes then extending to ruin the starter home stock for future generations?
- Policing: with the recent spate of burglaries (of which I am a victim) what will be done to increase police presence in the area?
- Existing roads: they are a disgrace! Pot holes everywhere - more cars - more road damage!

Presumably consideration has been given to the increase in traffic that will occur. Traffic leaving Perton via A41 is already having problems at rush hours. I have concerns about the number of gardens that are being paved for parking, causing flooding during rainy seasons as there is nowhere for the water to go. Larger pipework seems to be necessary. Doctor’s surgeries are going to need extra space for more doctors to avoid waiting times being extended. Similar needs for dentists.

All proposed sites would increase the level of traffic and congestion in and around the area.

The sites could all increase and overwhelm services on Perton such as the GPs, schools, play facilities, bus services, access problems, retail facilities.

Serious consideration needs to be given to traffic flow, schooling, GP services and water drainage as Perton already has problems in these respects.
All sites - Additional traffic will compound the problems which already exist when exiting the Perton village via Perton crossroads or the A41. Road access to enter and exit the village via Yew Tree Lane and The Fieldhouse end of Perton Ridge will be needed to avoid half hour queues morning and evening. Don’t forget the road between Perton crossroads and A41 is a rat run from Wombourne, Trysull, Sedgley and Dudley to the east side of Wolverhampton, Pendeford and the M 6.

Site chosen needs to consider roads - additional vehicles regardless of where houses built - only site 246 can provide this.

With all developments there is upheaval, its wildlife as well as the local human population. However at present there is a lot of wildlife in this area, foxes bats, frogs, newts, not forgetting pheasants, woodpeckers, fieldfares. We don’t want to lose this. Many of us have actually encouraged the wildlife. Skylarks can be heard in summer and even the occasional cuckoo.

I have heard suggestions the development could be spread over a number of sites, but again, could this not open the way to continually expand in all these areas for the future.

Concerns are around traffic - in and out of the village (A41 and Bridgnorth Road).
Concerns of drainage, Perton used to flood.
Impact on schools, local facilities.
Improvements for access onto A41 would be beneficial to the whole village.
Recreational area for new development would be beneficial.
Would want to see any developed area designed with a sympathetic consideration of the local landscape already existing.

I’m looking at moving to a bungalow would not want it mixed with other larger houses. Not particularly an old age retreat but considerate.

I heard that an access road would be created through Penda Grove which I am totally against as it would lead to more traffic into Mercia Drive.

Future houses must reflect extra facilities for Perton i.e. Doctors, shops, schools etc. As much green belt should be retained as possible.

We need as much greenery as we can and to stay out of Wolverhampton. Need to occupy youth more.

Although we have previously sent our comments we have found today very informative. The main concerns were how much affordable housing was to be built and we now know this is 40%. We are against large buildings such as flats or three storey but a mix of bungalows, semi and detached so as not to take away all of our already stunning views is more preferable. Roads, schools, seating (park areas) will need to be looked at. The proposed plots need to fit neatly into the landscape and the views and walks need to be kept.
People at meeting seem to think linking Perton to Wolverhampton with more housing is likely to mean Wolverhampton can take Perton over. We don’t want that. But those sites next to Wolverhampton border are best of building rather than expanding across Main Road into Perton.

Need more access on/off Perton via Yew Tree Lane, Perton Ridge? To spread vehicles out. Not happy that hadn’t heard about plans from council. Only found out today by email from friend. Couldn’t something have been sent out with Council Tax Bill a few months ago?

Two letters were received from children in Perton. They were requesting help for their family in acquiring social housing – currently urgently need 4 bedroom house. (Letters in file).

3. Site specific references

Site Reference No.238a – Land at former Perton Court Farm

This site has problems of coalescence and encroachment. There is a danger of Perton being swallowed up by Wolverhampton. This site has more direct negative and environmental impact on existing housing (125+) than any of the other sites. If access to traffic was made on the inner edge of this site the congestion on the small roads in the Edge Hill Drive area would be severe and create a public hazard. Also, if the access was from Jenny Walkers Lane this would negatively affect direct traffic in and out of Perton. It only fulfils 6 of the strategic objectives of the core strategy. Site 407 is my preferred site for the expanding of the needs of Perton. It fulfils 11 of the strategic objectives as stated in the core strategy. It is a large site and so can provide all the housing and community needs and also provide safeguarded land for the future. It is close to the village centre and has existing access from the road on the edge of Perton, which will minimise traffic congestion. It would have less impact on existing households than the other sites suggested. It is close to recreational footpaths and to the existing golf club. This site has no coalescence and encroachment issues. It would have defensible boundaries at the Staffordshire Way and the golf club. If you look at all the other sites to choose from, none of them have the complete set of advantages that site 407 offers.

Site appears to be most suitable one for proposed housing development. It abuts the existing development and there would be safer access for children going to school.

Least impact to rest of Perton. Safe across from traffic islands. Nearer to Codsall High School. Natural road and footpath across to Perton. Removes the dangerous access to Bradshaw’s Farm Shop (existing road deaths).

246a, 238a – would be better options for access on to and around Perton.

Definite no road access non-existent and not thought out.

Sites 238a and 402 I feel would be unsuitable due to flooding which occurs in Rowton Avenue and since those phase of properties were built has never been resolved even though a very large holding tank has been installed. The walkway close by is periodically flooded and even though new manholes have been installed still hasn’t resolved the problem. I very much feel that more housing in this particular area would only exacerbate the situation, so I would recommend site 407. Even today as I walk from home to this exhibition the walkway is flooded and has been for the last three days.
Too close to existing border with Wolverhampton – possible encroachment/boundary re-organisation.

Good design, links well to existing village. Good green buffer to existing housing. Would affect us less than other proposals. I support this plan.

Joints Perton with Wolverhampton, danger of losing Perton to West Midlands – Want to stay in South Staffordshire.

Sites 241, 402 and 238a would be the ones most affected existing residents so feel these are the least acceptable. Would be concerned re layout of “buffer zones” and the extent of them. 241 and 402 are too small to have much of a buffer zone. 238a is the one where residents are most likely to be affected in number. Also of all sites submitted, the development is cramped into one corner with a buffer zone of 50m whereas there is much greater buffer to the south and west – Perton Ridge and Wightwick. This is not my favoured site. If 238a is the chosen option, this would probably continue to expand in all directions from the original planned site suggested in the north-west part of the field and merge with Wolverhampton.

Sites 238a and 402 – I do not wish to see development on these two sites due to encroachment towards Wolverhampton, this green belt provides a natural barrier from urbanisation to the green open village of Perton allowing children to develop with a sense of nature which is paramount in today’s society.

I think site 407 and 238a are the best sites. Want to stay out of Wolverhampton.

With regard to leisure facilities for youth I believe children should have input and assist in development of facilities because I think they respect and look after amenities they have contributed to.

At least the traffic is likely to exit via Jenny Walkers Lane if going to Wolverhampton. If going north it will add to my problem.

Current green space should be maintained: this area should be designated as a village green.

Should not be developed.

238a will join us to Wolverhampton boundary. Bad drainage. Road through Perton village.

238a, 402 – These two sites are too close to Wolverhampton. Imagine the loss of council tax. South Staffs would suffer should boundary changes bring Perton into West Mids. Access to both sites poor. No 402 representation.

Traffic would go south and not north favoured.

238a and 402 – I wish to keep as much space between Wolverhampton and South Staffordshire. The green space between both areas is extremely important to maintain the gap.
Site Reference No. 239 – Land west of Wrottesley Park Road (south)

This site has no issues of coalescence and encroachment from one settlement to another. It has natural access via island. Close to village centre. Large enough for housing requirement and could offer safeguarded land for the future. This site would help sustain existing local businesses, in particular, Bradshaw’s Farm Shop and Brownies Nurseries, which would be in easy walking distance. It is convenient for the facilities at the Golf Club. The Golf Club acts as a defensible boundary. It is close to Staffordshire Way and other paths thus encouraging a healthier lifestyle. It fulfils 11 of the strategic objectives of the core strategy.

Site 239 also has an ideal opportunity to include all residents old and new. However one concern is the plan to offer money/funds for children.

Having been a Perton resident from the beginning some 38 years now, myself, family and friends volunteered for years to support and raise funds for the community hall, for facilities for the children. However, from the day the doors opened they have not been across the threshold causing concern for 239. Perton children are always made to feel second class, in regard to sports facilities, supervised activities, even when it comes to West Midlands travel passes.

Preferred option Site 239. No significant impact on existing village with easy access off existing traffic island. Development size would meet immediate and future needs.

Given the current infrastructure shortfall in Perton site 239 is favoured.

Proposal re-routing of Wrottesley Road through the new housing development will seriously disrupt flow of traffic on and off Perton and around it.

Utilising existing south island appears well thought out in one respect but negative in other option.

239 and 246a are in my opinion the obvious sites for new development. As traffic leaving and entering Perton is always a concern – better traffic management at Wergs Road traffic would be essential for these sites to be viable.

239 and 246a seem to be the most reasonable sites for new development. As traffic entering and leaving Perton is a concern – better traffic management at Wergs Road traffic would be essential for these sites to be viable.

239 and 407 – Both have access to Wrottesley Park Road and would not bring traffic to small existing roads. They both have plans for allotments and parking. There are no long distance views from the road to detract from this pleasant area of Staffordshire.

239 and 407 – Both sites are suitable for development. We would want to see affordable housing for first time buyers. Bungalows for elderly residents, and a mixture of larger units in keeping with existing Perton houses. We need to review the facilities for schools, doctors etc at an early stage. Also bus services must link into the new development and not be an add on. Any development needs to be part of the village, so that they don’t feel isolated from the centre, this is important.
Lack of detail at present – probably ok.

1) Infrastructure already in place with island for building site construction traffic.
2) Thoughtful planning structure for future development of further housing.
3) Recreational plans for allotment site.
4) No major disruption to existing householders.
5) Reduce speed i.e. humps into new development.

No footpath or easy access to main centre shops.

Small retail development would be necessary to provide essential provisions i.e. newspapers, bread, milk etc. so that unnecessary journeys would not be made in a car, this would lessen traffic chaos and also would be competition for Sainsbury's.

239 - Reasons for:
1) Already have infrastructure in place re. main access road/island for building construction traffic, (not affecting existing houses/cul-de-sac etc.) (perhaps reduced speed limit to 20, and speed bumps by entrances to estates, so traffic doesn’t speed onto main roads).
2) Thoughtful planning e.g. allotments/structure for future development of houses.
3) Importantly no major disruption to existing householders etc. (sensitively planned) because of access road in place.

No footpath or easy access to main shopping development. A small retail area needed to provide basic essentials (bread, sugar etc) for those with/without a car, so that a car does not have to be used for such items/unnecessary journeys etc. so as to lessen traffic chaos. Retail competition is needed wherever housing development takes place because Sainsbury's have had a local monopoly for too long (too expensive), a small Aldi perhaps (as developed at Bridnorth) sensitively placed would be hit with other lcoals (save a journey to Wolverhampton).

Minimum impact to traffic on the estate.

This site would be deemed more suitable, both for access and minimum impact and traffic problems.

Site 239 is another contender but not to such a great extent. However, again – spacious and one option favours all residents by slowing down the traffic and eventually closing part of the current road alongside the western edge.

246a, 407, 239 – I have no issues except the existing problem of queuing traffic to get off Perton in the morning. I can only exit via A41 as I work in Stafford. I feel that it is ridiculous to expect us to queue from The Pear and Partridge to the A41 when little traffic seems to cross the A41 to Cosford direction.

Self contained area satisfies requirement without fear of expansion. Totally contained within Perton.

Natural boundaries (Golf Course). Infrastructure in place – Roundabout/Bus Route. Again, least impact on current residents as it is 'stepped' away south/west.
Order of preference 407, 239, 246. Access available clear of existing roads which are clogged at commuter times. Sites would accommodate all present requirements plus room for future development.

407, 246a and 239 – should not be developed as this will cause urban sprawl across the W rottesley Park Road into green space much better to keep any development within the existing road boundaries of Perton e.g. 238a or 241.

Site Reference No.241 – Land off Dippons Lane

This site is a small site and does not have the capacity to build all the houses needed. This site has no problems of coalescence or encroachment. However, it does not have the space for extra community facilities and has access problems. It fulfills 11 of the strategic objectives as stated in the core strategy.

Could be viable if access was opened onto back road.

It is my strong objection to site 241, in its potential to cause great harm and concern to the children of Perton in its vicinity of the school.

Site 241 loss of wildlife habitat including newts, fox, badger, birds. Already difficult to exit the estate during rush hours. Side roads not wide enough for any proposed increase in traffic. Land and adjacent areas subject to flooding during heavy rain, as the area is within the floodplain of the River Penk.

Least preferred option Site 241. Significant impact on existing village. Very poor access to site – existing roads not suitable. Small size of site would mean development still required elsewhere. Reduces size of “barrier” between Staffordshire and West Midlands. More than one access route would probably be required onto site, creating even bigger impact on existing community.

Access is not advised through Perton Grove or Idonia due to the road structure around the site is very old and frail, plus roads would have to crossover. Dippons Lane was unadopted land surrounded by preservation orders on mainly oak trees. Perton Grove particularly the sewerage has been an issue with Severn Trent being involved, so where will the water issues go regarding housing on this land? The sites around the outside of Perton will surely be better used as it will surely hold all of the housing that is needed with the least amount of disruption. There should also be a revision of the areas on an off Perton as there is always a problem at peak times with cars accessing the village, surely this will be doublefold.

Penda Grove is largely bungalows owned by elderly/disabled folk. The environment in this area is quiet and safe. Additional development and the disruption it brings would be detrimental to this area and its inhabitants.

The parking in Idonia Road is already an issue and as this is a cul-de-sac at both ends to put across another road from Toms Road would greatly increase the danger of road accidents. Also the amount of teenagers using Yew Tree/Dippons Lane to race motorcycles is adding extra danger to this area.
I moved here in 1978 and the plans we saw then in no way represented what is happening now, as the main roads around Perton were not designed for the traffic we have now.

Do not agree with this proposal due to: Road access from I donia Road is not viable due to width of road and number of on-road parking. Chopping down of oak trees and disturbance of wildlife that we should be preserving eg. bats. Children use Dippons to walk to school. Easiest access to the site is in Yew Tree Lane. Why send people all way round Perton if they can access via Yew Tree Lane. Small site but would create significant traffic increase.

We believe this site should be grazing land or allotments. The wildlife will be highly affected, bats, foxes, badgers, newts, woodpeckers, squirrels. The clearing of trees put by Perton “Wild about Perton” to feed the animals/wildlife is a disgrace. The open session was fantastic (Community Council). Site 241 is a danger for all children walking to school and should be accessed between 8-9am in the morning.

Site 241 - No information.

Dippons Lane – Prefer site as close access to existing schools and facilities. Close walking to shops etc reduces car transport requirement. Green belt strip can be maintained similar to areas to south of Perton. Do not want green belt encroached towards Pattingham unless site by golf course as this has a boundary.

This site is definitely a no-no. Firstly access to Dippons Lane is very difficult, roads would have to be widened and due to its close proximity to Perton Middle School – students would have concerns with safety on their journey to school. The site is too small and will connect Perton to Wolverhampton.

Site 241 is in my opinion a no no. Access from Dippons Lane would have to be widened. Too close to Perton Middle School, concerns for students’ safety. Site is too small and will connect Perton to Wolverhampton.

Do not agree due to access road via I donia Road, due to size of the road not adequate. Chopping down trees (oak trees) and disturbing bats and other wildlife. Children use I donia/Dippons to walk to school. Access needs to be via Yew Tree Lane. Traffic would be a serious issue, especially at peak times – already a serious issue.

Concerned that 241 does not afford enough space for first and second phase developments. Also concerned with access to this site if coming off Mercia Drive link with increase in traffic turning onto the Parkway.

We need to protect the wildlife, vegetation in the area in Dippons Lane and surrounding areas. We have a snake (wild) in our garden (Idonia Road) also newts and lizards. Extra traffic in I donia Road would jeopardise all wildlife etc. and ruin the countryside feel.

Dippons Lane - The wildlife must be maintained. I have seen quite a few snakes and lizards in this area as my garden backs onto the lane, also badgers and foxes have been seen. Traffic into I donia Road would not be advisable the only thing that would be of any use would be a road into Yew Tree Lane to roll alongside the bus lane making it cars only that would help save the planet (petrol/air pollution). Dippons Lane – Serious concerns about the traffic in this area and that Wolverhampton Highways share our concerns and have refused access. However, the location of the new potential route is
of serious concern and I am completely against the use of land currently used by Perton Middle School. The governors' intentions to improve childhood fitness and health contradict the developers' intentions of taking away part of their playing field that they use for sport and exercise. Wrottesley Road plans are far better and safer. Ensure safety of existing residents and refrain from using this site – other sites on Wrottesley ensure least impact on Perton – increasing the site of Perton, increasing the community but allowing existing residents to travel to school/work safely and yet enjoy the facilities of the new development.

Dippons Lane site not suitable near to school. Also River Penk and wildlife in this area.

My house backs on to Dippons Lane and then this site. I have always thought that one day it would be changed - but there is no access and if the wonderful green spaces at the end of my road, Penda Grove and Idonia Road, were used the facilities we have would be ruined for many children and people. It would be an environmental catastrophe.

Site 241 Dippons Lane is nearest to me. I understand access would be either Gainsborough Drive or Penda Grove or Idonia Road, all of which are fairly narrow roads and poor access. The proposed site will only cater for part of the allocation so other sites are needed and for Phase 2. It is possible for a school to be built on the site but again heavy school traffic would not be ideal on those narrow roads.

241 - Dippons Lane – Worst of proposed sites.
1) Least well planned, lack of space.
2) Access has to be through existing built up areas
3) Increased traffic around school and across popular walking route for school children.
4) Destruction of existing woodland to provide access.
5) Increased traffic in area with a lot of young children/families and elderly.
6) Field already popular area for local dog walkers/recreational walkers.
7) No associated benefits to existing resident, i.e. no new leisure/recreational facilities.

This is an enclosed site with no vehicular access at the moment. To make an access would disrupt current householders. Gainsborough Drive is used by parents dropping off school children, delivery vans for the school and buses using the wrong side of Gainsborough Drive.

Access to this site via Idonia Road would cause dangerous safety issues. Other roads have better access to what is effectively a trapped piece of land. Idonia is too narrow and there is already a street parking issue. The change of use of the road from a dead-end to through traffic will affect all of the families in the area. Young children expecting to be relatively safe would be in danger. Other sites would cause less safety issues and less disruption to traffic flow. It must be considered the overall impact on traffic leaving and joining Perton needs review to avoid traffic jams in rush hour.

This site would cause even more congestion and safety issues on the adjoining roads, i.e. Penda Grove, Idonia Road, Mercia. My understanding is that this was green belt area and as such protected from development. In regard to the site via Idonia Road the street has young children living there and this would be extremely dangerous. I am sure other site would be more suitable and less of a health and safety issue.

Does not give enough housing to meet 163 needs - Gainsborough Drive inadequate for increasing traffic needs - Do not support.
If a development is built off Dippons Lane all the traffic will have to travel via Penda Grove, Idonia Drive and Mercia Drive. These are residential roads, they are narrow and have parked cars at the kerbs overnight. The potential for damage and injury along these roads is frightening. Why not build a road to access Yew Tree Lane?

Sites 241, 402 and 238a would be the ones most affected existing residents so feel these are the least acceptable. Would be concerned re layout of “buffer zones” and the extent of them. 241 and 402 are too small to have much of a buffer zone.

Site access to traffic very poor, existing roads very narrow, will not fulfil all developments.

Land of Dippons Lane - Very concerned with many aspects of this proposal.
1) Access
2) Size of plot means another (less preferred) site will also be required to meet 163 property obligation.
3) Adjacent school safety
4) Disruption to local properties.

One of the best things about Perton is that it's well planned and built! Everything has been done properly and is well laid out to try and “shoe-horn” 80-100 houses onto this land with the inadequate access proposals would be a travesty when there are clearly better alternative sites with easier access too. This land is a field which floods and houses numerous wildlife species and trees which the council tells me you are not even allowed to prune.

Site 241 is not suitable for new housing it is very water logged and would cause problems for houses in Penda Grove and Idonia Road. It would be devastating for the wildlife, should the Middle School be extended in the future this land would be required for playing fields for the school. With more houses on Perton this will mean more children looking for a local school.

Worst 241 loss of land and nature conservation.

Dippons Lane site will affect more people. No details of access road, Too small area.

241 unacceptable for access a danger to children playing there and walking to the schools also there is wildlife that will be disrupted by the building, i.e. Heron’s nest, newts in the ponds and bats. It is also a worry for traffic to get off Perton already in the morning due to only 2 sites leaving the village.

We don’t have passing bus service nearest stop Sainsburys 10 minute walk away. Roads not suitable for any further traffic they are too narrow. Drainage will be a problem and more houses could lead to flooding. Trees are for the wildlife and should be preserved. We only have 2 ways out of Perton and more traffic on the roads would cause havoc. Penda Grove is mainly elderly residents and we do not want any more upheaval. There is no space to park on the road which will cause accidents if more cars are up and down our road. School children use Penda Grove as a way through to the Middle School and would be dangerous.

Is the access road going to go along the edge of Perton Middle Playing Field or will Penda Grove be extended (by removing the end property)?
Field off Dippons Lane – Near Idonia Road. Building houses on the field, which had always been for public recreation, will destroy and environment for wildlife, e.g. bats, foxes, many different species of birds, flowers, trees, heron’s nests and newts and frogs in the pond. Also, Idonia Road has always been a cul-de-sac and is not wide enough to support construction traffic or any extra traffic from new houses. We bought our house because it has a lovely outlook and we are near to fields, somewhere to walk and take our dog and look at wildlife. If these houses are built the prices of our properties will go down and the road could become like a “race track” and small children will not be safe to play outdoors. This field has already been hacked to bits by Staffordshire County Council and apparently they have talked to the environment council, but has a full ecological survey been done? Idonia Road is totally and utterly unsuitable as an access road and it would spoil a beautiful environment. Also, I do not wish Perton to be any closer to Wolverhampton.

Field off Dippons Lane – Roads to this site unsuitable. There is a wide range of wildlife in this area. Ranging from foxes, heron and newts. Criminal damage has been committed by County Council, i.e. trees destroyed, hedgerows destroyed. I don’t want Perton any closer to Wolverhampton.

All sites, especially Dippons Lane – Site 241 – Don’t feel access to houses is fair to present residents. Children play/families walk this area. Traffic coming in and out of Perton is already congested in peak times. Additional houses would add to this. Also more houses would mean more children – could the schools accommodate them? Especially Codsall High? Would this mean a High School would be needed on Perton?

Site Reference No. 246a – Bradshaw Estate, Holyhead Road

This site has natural access at the island. No issues of encroachment and coalescence from one settlement to another. It is on a bus route. This site would help sustain existing local businesses, in particular, Bradshaw’s Farm Shop and Brownies Nurseries, which would be in easy walking distance. It has least negative impact on existing residents due to green buffer. It is very close to the Staffordshire Way and other paths encouraging a healthier lifestyle. It has good access to the village centre. It fulfils 10 of the strategic objectives as stated in the core strategy.

Site 246a offers nothing to children rather than open play sites which Perton already has plenty of.

Site 246 Bradshaws should be used. Easy access from road roundabout. Doesn’t affect others on Perton. Links in with village. No drainage issues.

Site 246a is the best site to be used as it does not impact on houses already in situ. It has clear benefits in respect of footpaths giving access to village centre, also has good vehicular access. I do not believe there are any drainage issues with this site. The size of the site is large enough to accommodate the proposed housing development.

246a, 238a – would be better options for access on to and around Perton.

A well thought out balance approach taking into account the traffic needs of the development and village. Good housing and landscaping.
239 and 246a seem to be the most reasonable sites for new development. As traffic entering and leaving Perton is a concern – better traffic management at Wergs Road, traffic would be essential for these sites to be viable.

I am extremely concerned, as are all the resident of Cranmoor, about the impact the development proposals will have on the green belt, which contains varied birdlife, bats and many other species. The residents of Perton enjoy this natural habitat as well as the residents of Cranmoor. We are also very concerned about the traffic situation which is already difficult at morning and evening peak times.

This site does not cause any problems for existing Perton resident and would not inflict any further traffic congestion. It is close to Perton and neighbouring villages. It offers ability to create all types of housing mixed with facilities.

Wonderful views – Just like Constable country – Let’s keep this as it is – Please!

I favour 246a or 407 as having least impact to existing layout of Perton, provided walkways can be agreed, otherwise site 239.

246 preferred. Existing road (Wrottesley Park Road) on edge of village would alleviate any further congestion within the village, both for building contractors and new residents.

407 and 246a could impact on land drainage problems that already exist on parts of Perton. They would also impact on the already congested access roads on and off Perton. 246a has a footpath route proposed that would cut through woodlands having a detrimental effect on trees and wildlife currently living in the habitat.

Closest to us to inevitably do not support. Traffic issues as A41 lights would need to be improved. Long way from village centre or bus stop.

Perton Green – I am concerned about the drainage in this area and the propensity for flooding. Will the River Penk be dredged in the area by the Pear and Partridge which has a history of flooding?

Prefer 246 – Least impact on Perton and will keep existing green land. Road signs aren’t wide enough to cope with extra traffic especially when people park on roads too.

Great proposed development of existing local farm shop and improvements to road infrastructure. Well thought out design and employment opportunities through units. Least impact on existing homeowners.

This is the best solution as the traffic would not affect either island. Between 8-9 traffic is at a standstill at the north island.

This site would be deemed more suitable, both for access and minimum impact on residents.

Sites 407 or 246a – Having attended 9.5.14 at Perton Civic Centre and viewed plans, would feel sites 407 and 246a would be the best. Both are sites which offer spacious development. In favour of the Brashaws (246a) this would have no impact on any existing residents in terms of being adjacent
to their properties nor would it have a great impact re. traffic - particularly liked here the fact that there is talk of improving road junction at north end of Perton by the nursing home.

Sites 407 and 246a - These sites are more appropriate as there is more room for green space with housing development and room for community facilities which are needed. In particular 407 meets the need for future development beyond 2028.

246a is ridiculous as there's too many accidents and traffic coming along that route as it is.

246a, 407, 239 - I have no issues except the existing problem of queuing traffic to get off Perton in the morning. I can only exit via A41 as I work in Stafford. I feel that it is ridiculous to expect us to queue from The Pear and Partridge to the A41 when little traffic seems to cross the A41 to Cosford direction.

246 least effect upon road network. No impact upon village.

Best site - Most suited as woodland/shape of boundaries means a more naturalistic development, not a 'Blucky' estate. They are proposing a left filter lane from Wrottesley Park road onto A41. The only developer able to provide relief to current/future traffic congestion; a major concern! Access to roundabout. Is on a bus route. Will have no immediate/direct impact on any individual Perton residence; everyone is happy! Possible sewage foundation thanks to Cranwell?? Is on a cycle route (W.Park Road). Good access to Perton Centre (vehicular, foot) and Codsall Centre. Fulfils all core strategies, and is 'bounded' to protect sprawl.

Order of preference 407, 239, 246a. Access available clear of existing roads which are clogged at commuter times. Sites would accommodate all present requirements plus room for future development.

407, 246a and 239 - should not be developed as this will cause urban sprawl across the W rottlesley Park Road into green space much better to keep any development within the existing road boundaries of Perton e.g. 238a or 241.

407 and 246a - I believe these two sites are more appropriate. 407 is my favoured site because of the size of the plot. The road access would be safer to achieve on 407 and 246a increasing the size of Perton and allowing for extra facilities at these sites for all to use, meeting the needs of the future government building infrastructure for years to come.

Site Reference No.402 – Land at rear of Winceby Road, Perton

This site is a small site and does not have the capacity to build all the houses needed. This site has problems of coalescence and encroachment. If access to traffic was made on the inner edge of this site the congestion on the small roads would be severe and create a public hazard. It fulfils 11 of the strategic objectives as stated in the core strategy.

Sites 238a and 402 I feel would be unsuitable due to flooding which occurs in Rowton Avenue and since those phase of properties were built has never been resolved even though a very large holding tank has been installed. The walkway close by is periodically flooded and even though new manholes have been installed still hasn't resolved the problem. I very much feel that more housing in this
particular area would only exacerbate the situation, so I would recommend site 407. Even today as I walk from home to this exhibition the walkway is flooded and has been for the last three days.

Sites 241, 402 and 238a would be the ones most affected existing residents so feel these are the least acceptable. Would be concerned re layout of “buffer zones” and the extent of them. 241 and 402 are too small to have much of a buffer zone.

Sites 238a and 402 – I do not wish to see development on these two sites due to encroachment towards Wolverhampton, this green belt provides a natural barrier from urbanisation to the green open village of Perton allowing children to develop with a sense of nature which is paramount in today's society.

238a, 402 – These two sites are too close to Wolverhampton. Imagine the loss of council tax. South Staffs would suffer should boundary changes bring Perton into West Mids. Access to both sites poor. No 402 representation.

238a and 402 – I wish to keep as much space between Wolverhampton and South Staffordshire. The green space between both areas is extremely important to maintain the gap.

Site Reference No.407 – Land west of Wrottesley Park Road, (north)

It is the largest site of the six and has natural access off Wrottesley Park Road which would take traffic in a westerly direction away from the rest of Perton, easing congestion. I has no problems of coalescence (settlements joining together) and encroachment (settlements getting nearer to each other). It has defensible boundaries in the Staffordshire Way and the golf Course. This site would help sustain existing local businesses, in particular, Bradshaw’s Farm Shop and Brownies Nurseries, which would be in easy walking distance. It is the closest site to the centre of the village offering better access to services. It is close to the recreational facilities at the golf club and to the Staffordshire Way footpaths encouraging their use for a healthier lifestyle, leisure and recreation. As the largest site 407 offers greater capacity for the future offering of safeguarded land and community benefits. As it is adjoining to other sites in the SHLAA it can be surrounded by safeguarded land for future development. Site 407 fulfills 11 of the strategic objectives as stated in the core strategy.

Site 407 is an ideal opportunity to offer a good flow to traffic and a supervised area for children, which an area of this (Perton) capacity would benefit as at present this does not have.

Concerns regarding safety of children crossing Wrottesley Park Road – 40mph limit often ignored. Extra sewerage system – would it be connected to existing system? No footpath along Wrottesley Park Road at present.

This site addresses the traffic concerns with two traffic islands and a drive around sufficient green open spaces and landscaping are provided. It is vital that detached properties have access all around. Access to Perton by road is very poor with only two access points. With added people a further doctors’ surgery would be required.

Should not be used as no drainage site is not suitable. Roads are fast and dangerous. Wildlife damage. A working farm. RAF building. Access to village. By adding drainage streams risk to our children on an estate. How will you accommodate additional cars entering/leaving Perton? Schools – open more? High school if more houses. Community sports centre/pool etc.
Access to Wrottesley Park Road will be extremely dangerous and increase traffic on an already overloaded road.

Not suitable – traffic issues would cause chaos on Wrottesley Park Road.

I feel this will best protect the green belt and stop us merging into Wolverhampton.

239 and 407 – Both have access to Wrottesley Park Road and would not bring traffic to small existing roads. They both have plans for allotments and parking. There are no long distance views from the road to detract from this pleasant area of Staffordshire.

Best sites would be either 407 or 246a
• Ease of access to new properties without increasing traffic around primary schools on Upper Parkway.
• Sites well planned and thought out providing benefit to both new and existing residents – parkland, shops, business opportunity.
• Increase business to Bradshaws Farm Shop – walking distance.

239 and 407 – Both sites are suitable for development. We would want to see affordable housing for first time buyers. Bungalows for elderly residents, and a mixture of larger units in keeping with existing Perton houses. We need to review the facilities for schools, doctors etc at an early stage. Also bus services must link into the new development and not be an add on. Any development needs to be part of the village, so that they don’t feel isolated from the centre, this is important.

407 and 246a could impact on land drainage problems that already exist on parts of Perton. They would also impact on the already congested access roads on and off Perton.

Good for environmental and cultural areas, good for water drainage issues. Good for housing expansion.

Compulsory purchase of properties in Lytham not desirable.

Dangerous – Two main islands, plus a walkway for pedestrians would stop traffic completely each time children crossed the road to get to school. Health and Safety should stop this as one child injured at the junction would be one too many.

Access problems with narrow roads which could potentially cause accidents. This site supports varied wildlife including protected bats and owls. Due to its location this site would not be suitable for development. It is situated on a narrow lane which is already subject to increasing traffic loads.

Sites 407 or 246a – Having attended 9.5.14 at Perton Civic Centre and viewed plans, would feel sites 407 and 246a would be the best. Both are sites which offer spacious development.

Sites 407 and 246a – These sites are more appropriate as there is more room for green space with housing development and room for community facilities which are needed. In particular 407 meets the need for future development beyond 2028.

407 & 239 – Any sites which will cause a major increase in traffic along Wrottesley Park Road. Very concerned about the extra traffic along the Wrottesley Park Road – especially the vast increase in
noise pollution – as our house and rear garden back onto the road. Not looking forward to summer barbeques and being subjected to increased air and noise pollution.

Site 407 would be the most sensible for the new houses and would not cause too much inconvenience to Perton residents.

I think site 407 and 238a are the best sites. Want to stay out of Wolverhampton.

Would be ideal for easy access to the main roads and not cause too much upheaval.

246a, 407, 239 – I have no issues except the existing problem of queuing traffic to get off Perton in the morning. I can only exit via A41 as I work in Stafford. I feel that it is ridiculous to expect us to queue from The Pear and Partridge to the A41 when little traffic seems to cross the A41 to Cosford direction.

407 and others will affect traffic in the village.

Fears of leading to unchecked urban sprawl. W Park Road not suitable in current state to support an estate. Development promises too much and who will end up paying for parks – us? Farmland is aesthetically pleasing/productive!

Order of preference 407, 239, 246. Access available clear of existing roads which are clogged at commuter times. Sites would accommodate all present requirements plus room for future development.

407, 246a and 239 – should not be developed as this will cause urban sprawl across the Wrottesley Park Road into green space much better to keep any development within the existing road boundaries of Perton e.g. 238a or 241.

407 and 246a – I believe these two sites are more appropriate. 407 is my favoured site because of the size of the plot. The road access would be safer to achieve on 407 and 246a increasing the size of Perton and allowing for extra facilities at these sites for all to use, meeting the needs of the future government building infrastructure for years to come.
4. Housing types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>246a</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239/407</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238a</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
- 4: Flat
- 6: Town house
- 0: Affordable housing
- 12: Sheltered
- 11: Semi-detached
- 31: Detached
- 36: Bungalow

Total number of responses: 387

Bungalows were consistently popular, which may be down to the age range of those participating although in general terms the population does favour bungalows. In those areas where people expressed a view about affordable housing it scored very high. Detached houses were also popular which again may be explained by the desire for rather than what the community need.

Some respondents may have used this process to express their personal need/desire for a particular house type.

5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’
- Road improvements
- Sports & recreational facilities
- GP surgery & chemist

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

Perton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>246a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239/407</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238a</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance and Age Profile

- 0-18 yrs
- 19-39 yrs
- 40-60 yrs
- 61+ yrs

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken as joint venture with Perton Parish Council and was a dedicated afternoon and evening event held in the Community Centre at Perton. A number of parish councillors were present on the day. Unlike other events the Parish Council gave landowners the opportunity to have displays and be on hand to explain their plans to the general public.

The event was very well attended with a broad age range and mix of families. Many were already aware of the process and had also contributed in many different ways. A significant number of people highlighted the poor accommodation at the district council event which had been held a few weeks earlier.

In terms of general comments these were varied but fall into a broad range including: a) increased traffic and access in and out of Perton village, b) over development of the village, c) existing facilities unable to cope (GP, schools etc.) and d) coalescence with Wolverhampton.

In terms of Community Benefits people identified a wide range of benefits that the village needs but there was a recurring theme around; a) improvements to the roads and b) need for a secondary/high school.

With regard to the potential sites, site 246a and 239 were identified as the most favoured by those attending the meeting with 241, 238a and 407 as the least favoured sites.

There were an overwhelming number of specific comments lodged at the meeting in respect of sites and these are contained within this main document. In addition a number of people had compiled petitions and they were advised to lodge these with the District Council.

There was no general consensus on mix of house types needed for the area.
Site Allocations

Perton
Community Council of Staffordshire

South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 5 – South – Swindon

1. Potential community benefit

- Housing mix
  - Bungalows, sheltered

- Road improvements
  - Drainage needed in re-laid road
  - Road is uneven/drainage and is causing serious flooding.

2. General comments

Use land behind affordable housing using a CPO on pub car park to put in a road. You then have existing facilities, electricity, sewer, water etc.

Car parking required for shops. Older folk find it difficult to drive.

Consideration should be taken about the volume of traffic merging into Wombourne Road, the school is situated on this road and road calming measures seem to have little effect.

Build houses with allocated car parking spaces, Ensure enough parking is made available, especially outside St John’s School, when Greyhound site developed will lose money.

Can’t believe it. Shocking. Will destroy the village. Is it really worth doing?

All sites - Adding more family homes to Swindon is welcome. As a father of three young children, I appreciate that more young blood is required in the village to keep the community spirit alive. Unfortunately, the recent addition of traffic lights at Sainsbury’s, Wombourne, has had a very negative effect on traffic through the village. Something needs to be done to make the village a safer environment for new and old residents to live!

I have lived in Swindon for 8 years and have noticed that the traffic has dramatically increased. If there are to be more homes the road structure and speed limits need to be more permanently in place, of example road calming, narrowing.
Will the Greyhound Pub have any affordable housing units? Very helpful Parish Council Chairman and Clerk. Advertisements and Parish News very good media locally.

We do not need houses built on the Greyhound, but down Hinksford Lane seems fine.


Please do not build on Grey!!

3. Site specific references

Site Reference No. 312A – Land off Church Road east (rear of Church Farm)

Land at 312a is protected as householders are owners. Topography of land not clear on the plans.

It is pretty obvious that site 312a is a no-no; too far from the village and too far for children to walk to school.

Site Reference No. 313 – Land off Himley Lane (site 1)

Loss of privacy for residents. Sites 313 and 315 are not suitable due to the width of Himley Lane, two vehicles cannot safely pass along this lane where the recent houses were built.

Access via Himley Lane for site 313 would be a particular problem from very narrow lane. What is the criteria for choosing between the greenfield sites? Would you build maximum identified on plan if only a smaller number of houses needed?

Site Reference No. 314 – Land off Wombourne Road (site 2)

No comment.

Site Reference No. 315 – Land off Himley Lane (site 3)

Site 315 not flat land - Tim Mundy land.

Loss of privacy for residents. Sites 313 and 315 are not suitable due to the width of Himley Lane, two vehicles cannot safely pass along this lane where the recent houses were built.

Site 315 should be considered as this is where the last houses were built.
Traffic problems - The junction at the bottom of Church Road with High Street is dangerous - it is blind from some directions, approached at excessive speed and sees numerous ‘near misses’, if not accidents. A solution would be to put a refuge in the middle of the road with a keep left bollard, and preferably change it from Give Way to Stop outside the Green Man.

4. Housing types

- Site Reference No.437 – Land off Church Road central (rear of Church Farm)

- Traffic problems - The junction at the bottom of Church Road with High Street is dangerous - it is blind from some directions, approached at excessive speed and sees numerous ‘near misses’, if not accidents. A solution would be to put a refuge in the middle of the road with a keep left bollard, and preferably change it from Give Way to Stop outside the Green Man.

Bungalows were consistently popular, which may be down to the age range of those participating although in general terms the population does favour bungalows. In those areas where people expressed a view about affordable housing it scored very high. Detached houses were also popular which again may be explained by the desire factor rather than what the community need.

Some respondents may have used this process to express their personal need/desire for a particular house type.

5. Facilitator’s report

- Community Benefits ‘top three’
  - Road improvements
  - Car parking
  - Pub

- Initial Feedback on-site preferences

- Swindon

- Attendance and Age Profile

- Consultee Awareness

- Total number of responses: 52

- Key
  - 2 Flat
  - 0 Town house
  - 25 Affordable housing
  - 4 Sheltered
  - 6 Semi-detached
  - 17 Detached
  - 46 Bungalow

- Bungalows were consistently popular, which may be down to the age range of those participating although in general terms the population does favour bungalows. In those areas where people expressed a view about affordable housing it scored very high. Detached houses were also popular which again may be explained by the desire factor rather than what the community need.

Some respondents may have used this process to express their personal need/desire for a particular house type.
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken as part of a community event based around the First World War. It was a popular event held at the Community Centre which attracted a wide spread of age groups. A large proportion of those attending had either not heard about the Local Plan Consultation Process or had not taken part in the process to date.

The overriding general comments being made related to the current unacceptable levels of traffic in the village and that this problem would be further exacerbated with additional development. In addition a number of people did challenge the need for more housing in the village.

In terms of Community Benefits, these comments predominately related to improving roads and highways.

With regard to the potential sites, 315 was the most favoured numerically with 314 being the least favoured. Residents referred to traffic and highway problems associated with the potential development of sites 313, 315 and 437.

In terms of housing mix the majority of people commenting felt that there was a need for more bungalows and affordable housing.
Site Allocations

Swindon
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South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 2 – North West – Wheaton Aston

1. Potential community benefit

- No comments.

2. General comments

Develop sites within the village first then along Ivetsey Road.

Priority 1 – Lowest impact first than best access.

1st time buyer properties then extend the facilities, i.e. GP surgery open every evening.

Before building more houses improve transport access and infrastructure to the village.

Has adequate affordable housing at the moment. More middle market and upper market housing.
Poor transport. No facilities for people without cars.

3. Site specific references

**Site Reference No.89 – Land off Badgers End**

I feel site 089 is the most appropriate, it will not encroach on existing housing and access will be easier to create. I also think the site of the Vaughan Arms, Lapley should also be considered for housing.

**Site Reference No.90 – The Paddock Hawthorn Drive**

No comments.

**Site Reference No.91 – Land at Brooklands**

No comments.
Site Reference No.92 – Back Lane/Mill Lane

Mill Lane cannot cope with HGV. Damage already on the road, continual problems with water pipe leaks in road due to heavy vehicles using road.

Site Reference No.94 – Land off Primrose Close

As Primrose Lane playground was funded through grant money, I believe it is wrong to then rip this out for the sake of housing development.

Site Reference No.93 and 377 – Land east of Back Lane

No comments.

Site Reference No.378 – Land off Broadholes Lane/Badgers End

No comments.

Site Reference No.379 – Land off Back Lane/Ivetsey

No comments.

Site Reference No.422 – Trevett House

No comments.

Site Reference No.426 – Land at Bridge Farm

Bridge Farm although is now being considered at a level 1, I strongly disagree as the housing planned is not in keeping with existing housing and there are further plans (I spoke directly to planning officer and there are a further 30 houses plus planned). This will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding environment. There was a problem and high expense with the electrical sub-station that was going to have to be moved so that the road had safe access.
Site Reference No.439 – Grey House Farm

No comments.

Site Reference No.442 – Land at Ivetsey Road

No comments.

4. Housing types

Too small a response to statistically measure.

5. Facilitator's report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

- Road improvements
- Sports and recreational facilities
- Shops and retail

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

Wheaton Aston

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>N o %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very few numbers

Attendance and Age Profile

Wheaton Aston

- Attendee Estimate 46
- Registration 35

- 0-18 yrs
- 19-39 yrs
- 40-60 yrs
- 61+ yrs

Consultee Awareness

- Unaware of the whole process
- Aware but had not contributed
- Aware and already contributed
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken as part of the Wheaton Aston Village Carnival, a whole day event that took place across the village with a show ring based at the school. Our presence at the event was supported by the Parish Council with a number of councillors appearing on the day.

Our stall was attended by a varied cross section of the community covering all age ranges and family mixes, however there was an unusually low number of older people attending. The vast majority of those we engaged with had not heard of the Local Plan Consultation process at all and of those that had over half had not taken part.

Those attending made general comments which in the main related to traffic and the impact that new development would have on the existing situation. In addition there was considerable concern expressed over public transport.

In terms of Community Benefits there was reluctance for people to comment too strongly in this area feeling that it would commit them to acceptance of development in general terms. However residents did raise the issue of a) a lack of activities for young people, b) poor local transport and c) possible improvement to local shops.

With regard to the potential sites, sites 89, 379 and 244 were the most favoured and the majority of the remaining sites were least favoured. The site of the Vaughan Arms, Lapley, was the subject of much discussion and it was suggested that this could be used for employment/office accommodation.

In terms of housing mix the general feeling was that there were enough affordable houses in the village and that if additional housing were to be built these should be middle to upper market housing.
Community Council of Staffordshire

South Staffordshire Site Allocations

Locality 5 – South – Wombourne

I. Potential community benefit

- Play space
  - Bratch Lane indoor gym for older children now.
  - Pool House too far from Meadow Lane.
  - Young family 5-6 year olds 2 swings only.
  - Recently changed for older kids provision.
  - Children’s Parks only one Pool House Estate need more.
  - Play provision for younger ages up to 5-6 year olds required

- Housing Mix
  - bungalows

- Road Improvements
  - Traffic calming, Orton Lane

- Car parking- might be affected by housing development

- Environmental Improvements
  - Drain cleaning
  - sewerage works will require capacity

- GP Surgery, Chemist
  - Dentist full. GP surgery full
  - ok
  - doctors additional surgery required

- Village improvements
  - priority

- Burial grounds
  - Sytch Lane ok

- Support setting up community groups
  - for the elderly and dementia sufferers
2. General comments

Need more affordable to rent single people and families. Already have enough housing don’t need any more. Sainsbury’s has killed off the shops. Car park by library is full of cars that are left there all day – ask shopkeepers. Don’t need any new housing in Wombourne, was a nice small village now getting too large. Don’t favour too much building in the centre, but don’t like green fields being built on. Traffic through the village is very bad - lots of rat runs to get to A449. No more building in Wombourne. How will the Secondary School cope? No real leisure facilities in the village - green spaces/football pitch. No more building in Wombourne - biggest village in UK already. Wombourne does NOT need any more new housing. Look at all the existing empty properties and flats above shops. Insist that they are used first. Wombourne does not need any more housing, largest village in the UK. Mixed housing, scattered sites. Affordable houses for local plan. Don’t over develop the village. Don’t want any more building in Wombourne. If building has to happen then only on brown field sites. No more houses needed, this is supposed to be a quiet village. It’s now turning into a small town. Schools are going to be hard to get into as they will be over-subscribed. The houses they build are too big and very over-priced. Keep Wombourne as it is.

3. Site specific references

Site Reference No. 279 – Wombourne Day Centre

No comments.

Site Reference No. 280 – Land at the Bratch, Bratch Lane

Pump House - Migrating birds spring and autumn. Bratch Lane has no footpath or access to public transport. Bratch Lock Bridge and old railway bridge are dangerous situations. Was told part of this was in the flood plain. Foxes exist on this site Access problems off most roads – public right of way - wildlife badgers, possible newts, bats are regularly seen on the site, fibre that doesn’t exist in other parts of Staffordshire. Sub-station on this site.
Concern on impact on Bratch, loss of ability to walk area, impact on local wildlife, impact on road Bratch Lane (traffic), loss of trees, other sites less impact on community, lack of green fields within boundary already.
The land is meadow land – has been untouched for years and attracts certain plants and butterflies.
Bungalows preferred.
Is within the “boundary” of the village but again access might be a problem.
Not enough affordable housing. Traffic and highways need improvements. Facilities can’t cope at the moment – Doctors and dentists full. Bratch Lane very small – need drastic improvements. Rat run Seisdon/Trysull along Trysull Road to A449 to go north/south and also to Sedgley. Bratch Lane / Victoria Grove roadside parking is bad at moment – SSHA taken away car parking.
Badgers lots of wildlife.
Badgers and wildlife.

**Site Reference No. 281a – Land off Ounsdale Road (part a)**

Ideal spots, but no public transport.
Currently a taxi firm operating from front of the site.
No problem with developing the site. Affordable housing or small units preferred for employment, would not need to use the cars.
Site would be good as it’s a ‘brown field’ site, however access would need due consideration.
No need for new housing in Wombourne. If we need any at all go for 281a and 281b.

**Site Reference No. 281b – Land off Ounsdale Road (part b)**

Ideal spots, but no public transport.
No problem with developing the site. Affordable housing or small units preferred for employment, would not need to use the cars.

**Site Reference No. 282 – Land to the rear of Wagon & Horses Public House**

Blind spot on corner for the 10 plots – consent already given.

**Site Reference No. 283 – Land off Bridgnorth Road**

No comments.

**Site Reference No. 284 – Lane off Gilbert Lane**

Flooding.

**Site Reference No. 285 – Land off Poolhouse Road**

Sand Martins on the land.
Sites Reference No. 287/288 – Land adjacent to Greenhill Farm, Sytch Lane

No comments.

Site Reference No. 289 – Brookside Hostel

No comments.

Site Reference No. 300 – Land off Bratch Lane/Flash Lane

Lapwings had been rare, now coming back.
Flood plain.
Bratch – access, wildlife, environment – increase in traffic – hump back bridge
Large plots at Station Road: 3 plots for 1 house. Better brown infill sites rather than green field.

Site Reference No. 302 – Land East Beggars Bush Lane

Impossible access from Beggars Bush Lane – single track road. Exit on to 449 has been made left turn only. (Although lots of people ignore this) have seen many near accidents. Traffic through Wombourne village is not feasible there is far too much traffic already.

Site Reference No. 415 – Land off Pool House Road/Clap Gate Road

No comments.

Site Reference No. 416 – Land off Orton Lane

Traffic problems.

Site Reference No. 417 – Land adj. Hartford House, Pool House Road

No comments.

Site Reference No. 438 – Land off Bratch Lane

438/300/280 – Access to sites – road under railway bridge on Bratch Lane has been changed to “Give Way” system. People not taking notice and very dangerous. Bridge over canal very narrow and difficult to pass. Several lorries have got stuck. Other access is Flash Lane – single road very narrow. Problems experienced at Greyhound junction in Lower Penn with lorries and narrow roads. Currently have issues with speeding traffic in above areas - this will be potentially multiplied e.g. possible 600 houses on plot 300? Wildlife in areas/plots highlighted by canal by Bratch Lane.
Do not want further development in Wombourne, especially not green field sites. If ‘village’ is expanded will there be more police, fire engines, reinstatement of ambulance station? Also traffic is difficult enough, lack of parking in village by shops and outside schools.

4. Housing types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281a</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281b</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bungalows were consistently popular, which may be down to the age range of those participating although in general terms the population does favour bungalows. In those areas where people expressed a view about affordable housing it scored very high. Detached houses were also popular which again may be explained by the desire factor rather than what the community need.

Some respondents may have used this process to express their personal need/desire for a particular house type.

5. Facilitator’s report

Community Benefits ‘top three’

- Road improvements
- Play space & equipment
- GP surgery, chemist/car parking

Initial Feedback on-site preferences

Wombourne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site No</th>
<th>Yes %</th>
<th>No %</th>
<th>Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281a</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281b</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Very few numbers

Attendance and Age Profile

Wombourne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Estimate</th>
<th>Registration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wombourne

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0-18 yrs</th>
<th>19-39 yrs</th>
<th>40-60 yrs</th>
<th>61+ yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultee Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaware of the whole process</th>
<th>Aware but had not contributed</th>
<th>Aware and already contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
6. Overview from Community Council

The consultation was undertaken over a whole day and spread across a number of locations including; library, children’s centre, job club, Co-Op Food Store and the leisure centre.

Our stalls were attended by a varied cross section of the community covering all age ranges and family mixes, but it was noted that there was not as large a number of older people as was anticipated. The majority of people who attended had no knowledge of the Local Plan Consultation Process and had not taken part before.

The overriding general comment being expressed was that the village should have no new housing development. In addition a number of comments were made in connection with the shortage of car parking in the village centre and the traffic within and through the village.

In terms of Community Benefits, those attended identified a range of these but there was a focus on; a) increased play space, b) road improvements, c) extension to the GP surgery and d) increased employment opportunities.

With regard to the potential sites, site 279 and 289 were with 287, 288, 416 and 417 the least favoured. In terms of specific comments about sites there was a considerable concern expressed over site 280 and the impact on wildlife in the area of the Bratch. Sites 281a and 281b were suggested as good employment sites. Flooding was identified as an issue in respect of sites 284 and 300 and valuable wildlife was highlighted on sites 285 and 300. Some residents highlighted traffic and highway issues in respect of sites 302 and 416.

In terms of housing mix the general feelings being expressed were that there needs to be more affordable housing.
Site Allocations
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7. APPENDICES

- Timetable for SAD Exhibitions
- Sample Comments Sheet
- Sample Potential Community Benefits Sheet
- Sample of the Community Assets photographs
- Sample of the House Types
- Screen shot of Facebook
- Screen shot of the Community Council Consultation web site
- Screen shot of survey monkey
- Sample of cards promoting access to consultation information
- Selection of event photographs
- Example poster
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and Event</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 21st April (Easter Monday)</td>
<td>Holy Cross Church Street Fair, Bilbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 1st May 3pm to 7pm</td>
<td>Parish Rooms, Brewood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 9th May 2pm to 9pm</td>
<td>Civic Centre, Perton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 10th May 11am to 3pm</td>
<td>Haling Dene “Let’s Celebrate Penkridge”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 21st May 5pm to 7pm</td>
<td>Annual Parish Meeting, Council Chamber, Cheslyn Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 7th June 12pm to 4pm</td>
<td>Codsall and Billbrook Scouts Carnival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 11th June 2.30pm to 5.30pm</td>
<td>Coven Memorial Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 15th June</td>
<td>Kinver Country Fair,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 18th June 3pm to 6pm</td>
<td>Fun in the Park, Village Green, Huntington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 28th June</td>
<td>Great Wyrley Carnival, Star Grounds (Not Allowed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 29th June 2pm to 6pm</td>
<td>Picnic in the Park, Community Centre Featherstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 5th July 1.30pm to 4.30pm</td>
<td>Pattingham Church Fete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday 6th July 1pm to 5pm</td>
<td>Wombourne Carnival, Civic Centre (Event Cancelled)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 12th July 10.30am to 12.30pm</td>
<td>Codsall Road Show Village Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12pm to 5pm</td>
<td>Village Carnival, St Marys School Field, Wheaton Aston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 2nd August</td>
<td>World War 1 Event, Community Centre, Swindon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 8th August 2014</td>
<td>Co-op Foodstore, Wardles Lane, Great Wyrley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 19th August 2014</td>
<td>Wombourne Library, Church Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-op Foodstore, School Rd, Wombourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure Centre, Ounsdale Rd, Wombourne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments Sheet

Please tell us which village and site(s) your comments refer to:

General Comments

Name:
Address:

Email address: Date:

*Please note that your contact details will not be published, but your comments are not confidential and will be used in a Schedule of Responses which will be published as part of the Site Allocations process.
COMMUNITY COUNCIL OF STAFFORDSHIRE
SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE SITE ALLOCATIONS CONSULTATION

Name: .................................................................
Address: ............................................................ Postcode: .........................

POTENTIAL COMMUNITY BENEFIT

Please tick the boxes that you feel are most important to your community

- Sports and Recreational Facilities (tennis, bowls, football) ....................................... ☐
- Play Space and Equipment ......................................................................................... ☐
- Housing Mix (starter, bungalows, apartments, sheltered) ........................................... ☐
- Community Building (new or improved) ................................................................... ☐
- Religious Centre ......................................................................................................... ☐
- Road Improvements .................................................................................................... ☐
- Car Parking .................................................................................................................. ☐
- Environmental Improvements ..................................................................................... ☐
- GP Surgery, Chemist .................................................................................................... ☐
- Village Centre Improvements ...................................................................................... ☐
- Allotments .................................................................................................................... ☐
- Burial Grounds ............................................................................................................. ☐
- Swimming Pool ........................................................................................................... ☐
- Support with setting up community groups (voluntary car schemes, good neighbours etc) ............................................................ ☐
- Heritage Work – Cultural Facilities ............................................................................... ☐
- Pub ................................................................................................................................. ☐
- Shops and Retail .......................................................................................................... ☐
- Employment Opportunities ........................................................................................... ☐
- Other (please specify) .................................................................................................... ☐

THANK YOU
Community Assets

Community building

Allotments

Road improvements

Play space and equipment

GP surgery

Heritage
House types

- Flats
- Bungalows
- Town Houses
- Affordable Housing for local people
- Sheltered Housing Private and/or Social
- Semi-detached House
- Detached House
Community Council of Staffordshire
Sample of cards promoting access to consultation information

Community Council of Staffordshire

South Staffordshire Site Allocations Consultation

HAVE YOUR SAY

The Community Council of Staffordshire is a local charity that is helping the community air their views on the future development of South Staffordshire.

E-mail - communitycouncil@staffs.org.uk
Telephone - 01785 242525

Community Council of Staffordshire

To follow us or get involved:

FACEBOOK
https://www.facebook.com/staffsroc

WEB SITES
http://www.staffs-farms.org.uk/
http://www.staffs.org.uk/

SURVEY
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/P67C93

For more information on planning please go to the South Staffordshire Council website
www.staffs.gov.uk
The voice of the people of South Staffordshire was heard during our consultations at local events and forums.

“Our village school would not cope with influx of children, they already turn away village children”

“We badly need affordable housing. We might need a bigger health centre”
Have your say!
NEW HOMES, NEW JOBS
What do you think?

SOUTH STAFFORDSHIRE
SITE ALLOCATIONS
CONSULTATIONS

Visit the
Community Council of Staffordshire Stand
at the Easter Monday Street Fair on
21 April 2014 at 1pm
Holy Cross Church
BILBROOK

Tell us so that we can tell them!

In Partnership with Bilbrook Parish Council