

Confidential**Birmingham Road**

AREA 0.089 hectares (0.22 acres)

Comments Received**Number Response from RBC**

Rear of land acts as noise buffer to existing residential properties	1	Traffic noise from A441 would be consideration for Env Health when commenting on an application
POS land in sustainable situation being close to town centre	1	Not designated as POS
Proposal supported for single house build provided retention of high, dense hedging and single dwelling only with sufficient garden area	1	Spacing standards would apply

Brooklands Lane

AREA 1.42 hectares (3.51 acres)

Comments Received**Number Response from RBC**

General Blanket Objections/petition	60	
Increased traffic/access issues	16	Highways would comment on the detail but no objection in principle.
Conservation site with abundance of wildlife, which would lose its habitat	11	Need to address in planning application supporting information
Rural environment eroded by more housing	8	
Land is of a boggy nature and prone to floods, making it unsuitable for building on	7	Flood Risk Assessment may be needed to support planning application
Considerable disruption, noise and pollution for nearby residents if building work commences	7	Planning permission will impose controls on building work
Disastrous effect on housing / housing prices	7	Property values not a planning consideration
Cannot be sold because is part of Arrow Valley Lake belonging to people of Redditch with restrictions to keep as parkland	6	Legal Services to confirm clear title.

Concerns about access from Brooklands Lane and possibility of further development of nearby fields	6	
Horse riders use land (bridal path)	5	Path to be re-routed under relevant regs.
Infrastructure not there to cater for more houses	5	
Security/privacy threatened by sale	5	
Other better suited sites (Brownfield Sites)	4	
Nearby Church Hill Centre could not sustain any more business	4	New housing may make local shops and services more viable
The area is needed for walking dogs	4	Difficult to prove in planning terms but site is adjacent to park
No school for new residents if houses are built as nearest (Marfield) was shut down	4	Planning would take this into account - contributions would be sought
Community as a whole affected and quality of life ruined	4	
Listed building nearby threatened	4	Planning would take advice from conservation officer
Area provides breathing space/buffer zone between developed area	3	
Don't want to live in middle of housing estate	3	
Wish to discuss plans with local Planners before any sale	2	
Came to live there because surrounding area currently beautiful and most residents elderly	2	
Concerned about type of people who would live in new houses	2	
Area used by children for recreational purposes e.g.. football	2	
Footpath on higher slopes of land which is used by walkers, cyclists etc.	2	
Lack of planning permission could allow travellers to purchase sites	2	Land could be sold with covenants restricting use
Existing amenities diminished if sold	2	
Believes land classed as greenbelt and could not be built on	2	
Believes land intended for "schools use" only	1	Designated as POS in AVP
Suggest land be used for allotments instead of housing	1	Could look at other sites but is demand proven (RK)

Route used as alternative to vehicle use encouraging eco-friendly environment	1	Route would still remain available.
Area currently low maintenance	1	
What type of houses to be built on site - private or Council?	1	
Suggest land be used as picnic area with better disabled access	1	Adjacent to AVP
Loss of POS would normally not be granted planning permission	1	Planners need to make argument on basis of policy criteria
Need for development does not out value land as POS	1	Policy R1 applies.
Danger of increase in fly tipping in area if access opened up	1	
Risk to mature trees in development	1	Planning would take advice from tree officer
Already plenty of homes - don't need any more	1	RSS indicates significant need for new housing

Clifton close

AREA 0.16 hectares (0.40 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Land should not be disposed of for special needs and this should be discussed with community before any decision made. (Comments on general objection form)	30	
Matchborough West Community Group should have the opportunity to find funding for a community meeting room. (Comments on general objection form)	30	
General objections by phone.	2	
Nearby terraced houses do not have front gardens so green space is required as amenity to enhance these properties.	1	
Concerns that public footpath will be lost.	1	
Concerns over what designated use will be.	1	
Land promised for extra parking for Drayton Close is included in site	1	
Sale will increase parking problems in area.	1	

Matter should be viewed by Council before proceeding	1	
--	---	--

Dilwyn Close

AREA 0.36 hectares (0.89 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

New build must compliment existing style - if so then development supported.	1	
Concerns over traffic	1	Highways would be consulted on planning application

Evesham Rd

AREA 0.07 hectares (0.17 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Garages currently in situ are required as Evesham Road, Astwood Bank does not have roadside parking. Offroad parking essential to the area.	1	Re-provision of parking as part of resi scheme acceptable in principle, but may make scheme unviable
---	---	--

Harport Road

AREA 0.65 hectares (1.61 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Increased traffic/access issues (mostly petition).	180	
Decrease in value of current properties (mostly petition). Would there be any compensation?	170	Not a planning consideration and no private land is being taken that necessitates compensation.
Worries about losing privacy (mostly petition).	168	
Detrimental impact on the community (petition)	166	
Loss of daylight if high buildings constructed (mostly petition).	164	
Sale will cause change to the outlook of many houses (petition).	163	

Land used for recreation (walking dogs/children playing).	16	
Land should remain open space for communal use	6	
Residents should be kept fully informed what is happening before sale.	3	
Worried about floods if land built on.	3	Flood risk assessment would be undertaken
Worries about more noise. Noise factor should be assessed.	3	env health would be consulted on planning application
Wildlife in area would be endangered.	3	
Concerned about who land will be sold to and for what purpose.	2	
Water mains under ground.	2	
Land needed for health and well being of residents	2	
Drains compromised by new houses using them.	2	
Selling of green areas is simple cost cutting exercise as Council don't wish to maintain trees in area.	2	
Development intrusive to rear of properties	2	
Elderly residents need to be taken into consideration.	2	
Will land be sold with planning permission or not and what conditions/restrictions would there be and how enforced?	1	
Boundary lines shown incorrectly on plan.	1	
Wish access to property maintained.	1	
Use for allotments instead	1	
Hedging will need to be maintained if site is to be built on.	1	
Costs involved in selling plot would outweigh benefits	1	
Increased footfall on footpaths leading to increased crime.	1	
Should develop and renovate existing housing stock first.	1	
Noise pollution caused by development.	1	
Footpaths would be damaged by new gas pipes being laid.	1	
Council's time better spent on other projects	1	
Abbey Stadium too far away - need to keep local spaces	1	
More pollution if have to travel by car to reach any other facilities	1	

Sale of land has previously been stopped and residents promised it would not be built on.	1	
Not enough schools to cope with new intake of people if houses built.	1	
Could the land be used for any other purpose than housing?	1	
Council selling land simply as a means to raise funds.	1	
Can area be broken up and made available for residents to purchase?	1	
Area too small for housing.	1	
General comments	1	

Heathfield Road

AREA 0.06 hectares (0.14 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Parking /Access issues	5	Would be considered as part of planning brief.
General enquiries.	2	
Claim of adverse possession.	1	
Site not big enough for housing.	1	
Building of houses would create upset to current residents.	1	
Planning permission required first.	1	

Hunt End Lane

AREA 5.97 hectares (14.74 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Wish to be kept informed of all decisions.	91	
General Objections	86	
Wildlife endangered by development.	48	Officers to investigate presence of protected species (Planning SHLAA comment). Bio-diversity survey would be undertaken.

Place needed for recreational purposes (walking dog/horse riding)	33	
Excellent views/environment that residents would not want to lose.	29	Noted but not a spatial planning matter.Planning conditions could require that development would be well screened
Increased traffic problems	26	Investigate through Highways Partnership the suitability of Hunt End Lane/ Windmill Drive junction to accommodate an increase in traffic from new properties (SHLAA Planning comment)
Flooding dangers to area as it is a flood plain/water balancing area.	17	
Additional population created by development would put pressure on local infrastructure including schools and hospitals.	16	
Trees in area damaged by development, some have TPOs	11	Development would need to comply with the TPO restrictions for New Town TPO 29 (Planning SHLAA comment)
Surely other land (pre-existing sites) is available for houses.	11	
Land provides screen/buffer zone from industrial area nearby.	10	A buffer will be retained between incompatible uses if this site comes forward for development (Planning SHLAA comment)
Request for better consultation/public debate.	9	
Detrimental social impact of development/loss of quality of life.	7	
Noise pollution/disruption caused by development.	10	Disruption from construction is a temporary issue (Planning SHLAA comment)
Houses will lose value if project goes ahead.	5	
Money gained for Abbey Stadium project no good for residents here.	5	
Green land was one of reasons residents moved to area.	4	
Government targets for new houses should not be at expense of existing home owners.	3	
Planning application misleading as plan is to build more than 20 houses (70 houses instead).	3	no application made yet

Site currently counters carbon emissions	4	
Greater access to Hunt End Lane increases security risks.	2	
Area is used for walking and exercising - if lost it would create health problems for residents.	2	
Taking away green spaces increases negative view of Redditch to others.	2	
Money gained from sale purely to meet Council's own costs.	2	
How can development of open space be justified?	2	against criteria in policy R1
Land listed for amenity use.	2	
If this area is developed, soon other areas will follow.	1	
Will Council compensate for disruption.	1	
Site not suitable for housing as land is steep.	1	Noted. However, Redditch is renowned for building on steep, undulating land due to its general topography (Planning SHLAA comment)
Closeness to Hunt End Industrial Estate would make any housing difficult to sell.	1	Woodland buffer strips would remain to avoid this.
Concerns over public footpaths.	2	Public footpath/ access would be maintained (Planning SHLAA comment)
Disposal to third party would mean loss of control/accountability re: intended use for land	1	Development would still require planning permission regardless of owner
If land sold now in current economic climate the best value cannot be obtained for it.	1	Council will only sell if best value is achieved.
Two paths are a potential PROW.	1	Suggest that arrangements are put in place during construction to keep public right of way open (Planning SHLAA comment)
Social Housing creating increased crime rate.	1	
What alternatives to generate funding for Abbey Stadium have been considered?	1	
Who exactly benefits from development?	1	Residents of whole borough benefit from Capital Receipt
Request for land designation in District Plan.	1	
Already oversupply of housing.	1	

Access is available from neighbouring housing development allowing non-intrusive access (positive response).	1	
Direct access to Enfield Road would create problems of people using area as a dog's toilet (creating mess and slipping hazards).	1	
Money from disposal should be used for more local amenities.	1	
Land complies with 2 policies in the Local Plan 3 so should, not be disposed of.	1	
RBC core strategy document said land was protected in future against development.	1	
If only some of land is developed, would rest be given special restrictions to prevent further development?	1	Yes

Moons Moat Drive

AREA 0.8 hectares (1.98 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

High hedge and trees must not be removed as provide buffer zone to counter traffic noise. Would be a health & safety issue.	1	planning would consult Env health
---	---	-----------------------------------

Moorcroft Gardens

AREA 0.51 hectares (1.27 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Area used for recreation (by children/walking dogs/horse riding)	72	
Petition signatures.	62	
Open space makes area unique and sought after and will be lost if development goes ahead..	51	
Wildlife will lose habitat if land sold.	45	

Increase in traffic and accidents caused by development.	43	Highways would be consulted by planning
Too many cars parked already - development will create more.	35	new development required not to worsen existing situation, not to improve it
Houses will loses value if land is sold.	32	not a planning consideration
Development would destroy uninterrupted views of Malvern Hills, Bredon Hill and Broadway Tower, across Worcestershire countryside and Severn Valley.	28	
Land maintains biodiversity of area.	21	
General enquiries.	9	
Increased pollution/noise/mess caused by new development.	7	
Current infrastructure not able to support new development	6	
Was told that land was POS so could not be built on.	5	unless meet R1 criteria
Other more appropriate sites could be used.	4	
Trees will be destroyed by development.	4	
Confusion over two different plans circulated.	2	
More consultation needed.	2	
Children forced to play on roads if land sold - dangerous!	2	
Development would cause increased level of water run-off and flooding.	2	
Development could have negative impact on land erosion.	2	
Wish to be informed of any public meeting.	2	
Area makes Redditch a nice place to live.	2	
Want response to queries.	1	
Is the land covered by the Callow Hill Ridge Landscape Protection Area?	1	Need to check with Dev Plans
Has the land been discounted by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for development?	1	yes
Development would be contrary to policy BCRA.1 of local plan 3	1	BRA1 not relevant as not in rural area
Land needs ecological assessment to determine presence of protected species.	1	
Not cost effective for developer to build on.	1	
Monies from sale used as revenue for Council and nothing to do with Government housing quota.	1	

Sale used to fund redundant Abbey Stadium project.	1	
Other methods of revenue should be found.	1	
Study into the Future Growth implications of Redditch report concluded area was unsuitable for development.	1	material consideration in planning process
Development will spoil original urban planning of Redditch.	1	
More youths prowling streets as a result of new development.	1	
Negative impact of current residents.	1	
Development in contradiction of Redditch Open Space Needs Assessment	1	
Loss of privacy caused by development in contravention of Human Rights Act.	1	
Land is only green open space on west side of Moorcroft Gardens?	1	
Land provides natural buffer zone between residential & green areas.	1	
Area used for photographers.	1	
Builders who built estate added cost of landscaping to price of houses so residents paid for this. Residents will get no recompense if land is sold off..	1	value not a material planning consideration
Sale would be "detrimental to amenity/character of street scene".	1	
Cramming, loss of street scene and open space is unacceptable under SPG "Encouraging Good Design Document".	1	
Estate already has enough houses.	1	

Mordiford Close

AREA 0.13 hectares (0.32 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Concerns over loss of play area	5	
Land needs to be officially designated as Primarily Open Space and as an "Informal Play Area".	1	

Paper Mill Drive

AREA 0.50 hectares (1.24 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

General comments	2	
Site is Buffer Strip for residential area reducing noise pollution and sale would breach health and safety..	1	
Part of Arrow valley Park and has deeds of covenant keeping as parkland.	1	
Area is nature reserve containing lots of wildlife.	1	
There are already office blocks in area, unused, so why build	1	
Increase of traffic hazardous.	1	

Petton Close

AREA 0.09 hectares (0.21 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

General objections (mainly petition).	77	
Play Area used by children and parents.	9	
Design accommodates outdoor pursuits, is in a safe area and should not be disposed of for building.	3	
Concerned about nearby pond and wildlife/environment	3	
Access concerns	2	
Tarmac area unmanaged but this is no reason for disposal.	1	

Rowan Road

AREA 0.06 hectares (0.14 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Request to be kept informed of all upcoming meetings.	3	
---	---	--

If any of the garages on the site are used for cars than alternative arrangements will need to be found to allow for house building.	1	
Development favourable to enhance street scene.	1	
Concerned that if garage taken away then no room for trailer or large items that cannot fit into garden. Possible clutter on frontages.	1	
Concerned over cost of removal of garages to pensioners	1	
General comments	1	

Salford Close

AREA 0.07 hectares (0.16 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Area needed for recreation.	4	
To build up to current footpath would create "mugging alley".	3	"Secure by Design" principles would be considered to avoid such matters.
Subsidence in area.	2	Ground survey would be carried out.
Parking issues.	2	
If current footpath is moved and replaced by driveway then damage could be caused by cars to properties level with it.	2	
Moving footpath would incur expense for Council that may not be recovered from sale of land.	1	
Only one house would be feasible due to new substantial driveway required.	1	This is a possibility that would be considered at planning application stage.
Cannot support development as area complies with 300m Open Space recommendation by Natural England in residential developments.	1	Redditch BC is considered to have an above average provision of open space
Open green space enjoyed by residents.	1	
Any new house would overlook current residents - privacy concerns.	1	
Development in contravention of Government's statement supporting play areas	1	
Housing would be even more packed than it already is.	1	

Loss of wildlife in area is development goes ahead.	1	
Residents need some "breathing space".	1	
Concerns over resident's fencing that borders site.	1	
New building would block sunlight.	1	
Objection to new window overlooking resident's back garden.	1	
General objections	1	

Tanhouse lane

AREA 0.32 hectares (0.78 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Area used as Play Area.	1	
Tree and Landscape Survey needed before development takes place.	1	Brownfield site, cleared for future development. Trees and shrubs have been cleared from the site with the exception of perimeter planting.
Objection as loss of open space will not comply with 300m recommendation by Natural England for informal play space provision.	1	Redditch BC is considered to have an above average provision of open space

Winyates Way

AREA 0.62 hectares (1.54 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Purchaser should retain boundary trees and establish window area at the lower end of Winyates Way. Trees will then give security and privacy.	1	
Provided trees protected during construction and any required boundary treatment compliments existing trees, proposal is supported to erect business premises on site.	1	

In event of Planning Consent, an environmental survey will be required in order to accommodate protected species and any mitigation found to be required.	1	
---	---	--

Wirehill Drive

AREA 0.73 hectares (1.80 acres)

Comments Received

Number Response from RBC

Quality of resident's life would be destroyed (mostly signatures collected).	12	
No proper consultation (signatures collected).	11	
Is this being sold for "Land 4 Leisure" or to meet Government's housing targets? (signatures collected)	11	Asset Disposal Programme will support capital schemes primarily the Abbey Stadium.
Sufficient land is available elsewhere to meet Government's plans on house building in Redditch (signatures collected).	11	There is still a deficit to meet current targets.
Council's Open Space Needs Assessment shows deficit of open space in Lodge Park ward so to develop land would deprive residents (signatures collected).	11	
Removal of trees and hedgerows would increase traffic noise from adjacent highways (signatures collected).	11	
Removal of trees and hedgerows would damage local wildlife (signatures collected).	11	
Traffic problems would get worse (signatures collected).	11	
Possible subsidence problems for new housing due to man made soil (signatures collected).	11	
When green space is gone it is gone forever (signatures collected).	11	
One of main reasons people live in Redditch is because of the pockets of green space (signatures collected).	11	
Area used for walking dogs.	1	
Are residents to be compensated for loss of greenery?	1	
More traffic creates more traffic problems. Some cars already have problems holding onto the road when turning sharp bend.	1	

Area is open plan estate - how can these rules now be changed?	1	
Footpath from any development needs to be maintained to green grassed strip nearby.	1	
Substantial hedge along site plays important role in character of area of Windmill Drive. It contributes to the quality of the urban area and should be kept.	1	
LP3 Policies R2 and R3 apply, with R4 for provision of children's play area within the development.	1	