

**FLYFORD FLAVELL, GRAFTON FLYFORD &
NORTH PIDDLER PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting held at The Flyford's Hall
on Tuesday 13th October 2026**

Present	David Waide (Chairman) Richard Croxton William Hewitt	Sadie Densham Tim Doughty
----------------	---	------------------------------

Linda Robinson attended by Zoom
Mark Broughton-Taylor attended as clerk

1. Apologies

Alison Crickmore

2. Declaration of Interest:

None

3. Public Participation

Members of the public were in attendance. The land owner for item 4i attended on Zoom.

Concerns were raised that the proposed development was not in keeping with the character of the village. It was also understood that there had been a pond adjacent to the development site and this had not been mentioned in the Environmental Report. The land owner stated that there had not been a pond within the red line in the past 35 years.

Concerns were raised about the sewage and drainage arrangement proposed for the development behind Meadowcroft. Further concerns were raised about the density of the proposed housing arrangement and the road layout.

Concerns were also raised about the disruption that development would create. It was noted that there was little parking available and that contractor's vehicles parked on the roads would cause chaos.

Concerns were raised by the adjoining owner to the west that the boundary and red line do not correspond. This matter should be addressed as it would appear that moving the red line creates more amenity space at the rear of the houses.

4. Planning Matters - To formulate comments:

i Application Number : W/26/02142/FUL

**Location: Land at (OS 9819 5481) Meadowcroft,
Bishampton Road,
Flyford Flavell,
Worcester,
WR7 4BZ**

**Description of Proposal: Erection of 9no. dwellings.
Applicant : Hagley Homes Limited**

Councillors discussed the matters raised by the members of the public in detail. The chairman asked for a show of hands of those present in the hall and there was unanimous agreement that the application should be opposed.

It was noted that a Water Management Statement had been provided by the applicant that proposed a solution to the drainage issues but it did not appear that there was any proof this would work and there was no comment from Severn Trent.

It was resolved that the comment previously submitted for application W/25/01449/FUL would be used as a basis for the parish council comment. This will be updated to address specific matters raised at the meeting and to address the changes in Local and National Policy.

The clerk was asked to draft the comment so that it can be agreed by councillors by email following the meeting.

**ii Application Number : W/26/02112/FUL
Location: Land At (OS 9830 5490)
Radford Road,
Flyford Flavell**

**Erection of 14no. dwellings including 4no. affordable homes,
together with a new access and new orchard, tree and hedge
planting.(Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of planning
permission W/25/01891/FUL)**

Applicant : Sandpiper TKL Ltd c/o Lockley Homes

This application was approved on the day of the meeting so no comment would be required.

Date of Next Meetings:

24th November 2026

Signed:

Date:

ADDENDUM

Comment as agreed by councillors and submitted on 19th October 2026

Flyford Flavell, Grafton Flyford and North Piddle Parish Council

W/26/02142/FUL

Meadow Croft, Bishampton Road, Flyford Flavell, WR7 4BT

Land At (OS 9819 5481) Bishampton Road Flyford Flavell

- 1.0 This is the official comment of Flyford Flavell, Grafton Flyford and North Piddle Parish Council.
- 1.1 A parish council meeting, open to the public and on Zoom, was held at The Flyfords Hall on 13th October 2026. The landowner was given the opportunity to support the application. All the comments from the public were opposing the application.
- 1.2 Members of the public were very upset that Wychavon had not informed previous objectors to development on this site of the new application. It was noted that there had been very little notification about the application and that very few people knew about it. This has caused confusion in the village and it is considered that members of the public have been poorly informed of the proposed development.
- 1.2 The Flyford Flavell, Grafton Flyford and North Piddle Parish Council oppose this application. It is noted that the parish council did not oppose the application for four houses - W/24/02405/FUL as it was considered the application was commensurate with the site and the context of the village.
- 1.3 Notwithstanding advice from the planning officer to the applicant concerning the density of the proposed development, the parish council considers this to be an ill advised application for the following reasons:

2.0 Location

- 2.1 The development would have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the area. It would extend beyond the present boundary of the village. It should be noted that 4 recent applications in the village have been refused on landscape considerations. Please refer to decisions on W/23/01592/PIP, W/23/01628/PIP, W/23/01134/PIP. The following grounds of refusal from W/23/01628/PIP are typical of the reasons for refusal of the other 3 applications. The parish council considers that they apply equally to this site.
 1. *The proposed development would result in adverse impact on the character of the landscape by reason of the location and land use which would result in encroachment into the countryside and introduce domestication within the rural landscape that would be uncharacteristic to the identified landscape*

character 'Village Claylands Landscape Type'. Subsequently the introduction of built form into this rural location divorced in nature to the built form of the village, would adversely impact the rural and historic dispersed setting of the area and would result in harmful visual intrusion of development into the landscape and open countryside. These identified harms would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SWDP21 (Design) and SWDP25 (Landscape Character) of the South Worcestershire Development Plan, 2016 together with the Worcestershire County Council Landscape Character Assessment 2018 together with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2021.

- 2. The application site lies outside of defined development boundary within open countryside. The proposed land use would fail to safeguard and (wherever possible) enhance the open countryside contrary to the strategic objectives of Policy SWDP2 (Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy) specifically Part A iii. within the South Worcestershire Development Plan, 2016. This identified harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal.*

- 3. The proposed development would be sited in a geographically unsustainable location with poor practical access to services and facilities and therefore future residents would be highly reliant on the private car to meet their day to day needs which would not reduce the need to travel and would result in increased car journeys and hence carbon emissions. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policy SWDP1 (Overarching Sustainable Development Principles) and SWDP4 (Moving Around South Worcestershire) of the South Worcestershire Development Plan, 2016 together with the sustainable objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. This identified harm would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits associated with the proposed development and therefore the development does not constitute sustainable development when assessed against the National Planning Policy Framework as a whole.*

- 2.2 Furthermore, the parish council has opposed over development on this site consistently for a number of years. Application W/25/01449 associated with 23/01778 was withdrawn on 20th May 2026 because technical difficulties could not be overcome. An application in 2014, W/14/00268/OU was refused and an appeal was dismissed in 2015, APP/H1840/A/14/221630. In his final paragraph the inspector summed up "Taking all those matters into account, I find nothing sufficiently compelling to alter my conclusion that development along the lines indicated would unnecessarily damage 'priority habitats', contrary to 'saved' and emerging planning policies and the advice of the Framework. Hence, this appeal should be dismissed." A further application was refused and the decision upheld at appeal in 2016,

APP/H1840/W/16/3160822. An application for one house in 2017, 17/02210/FUL was not opposed in principle by the parish council and permission was subsequently granted on 21st March 2018. The parish council considered this to be appropriate development for the site and the village.

- 2.3 The entrance to the site is off Bishampton Road in a sensitive and central location in the village. The applicant does not control the vegetation on each side of the visibility splay and therefore cannot ensure that safe visibility splays can be achieved and maintained. It would introduce added traffic flows to an area which is already very congested due to the school nearby.
- 2.4 The parish council has also drawn attention to issues of drainage on this site in previous applications. Evidence has been submitted of lying fluvial water on the field and there is very little space to provide suitable attenuation for a site of 9 houses. An attenuation ditch for the adjacent development of 16 houses was required which can hold 101 cu metres of water. The Water Management Statement proposes a system to store and then pump surface water into the foul sewer running along Bishampton road. Adding surface water to foul drains is in conflict with sustainability and will add to sewage overflow in times of high rainfall, which are expected to become more frequent with continued climate change. There is no confirmation from Severn Trent that the proposals will work or any technical evidence or calculations. Without detailed consideration of these issues the parish council deems that the location of the site cannot be approved. The application does not meet the requirements of NPPF (aug26) CC3 para 3, P3 para f, or policy F8 for sustainable surface water drainage.
- 2.5 Para HO2:5 of the NPPF (aug 26) requires the L.P.A. to identify the size, type, tenure and range of housing required in a particular location. The P C is not aware that any Housing Needs Assessment has been carried out for Flyford Flavell and does not believe that any such need has been identified in respect to this application. Again, the parish Council considers this a material consideration in determining the suitability of the location of the site.
- 2.6 The applicant has not been able to find any housing association to take on the affordable/social housing allocation for this site and has not demonstrated that discount housing is required in this location.
- 2.7 Para L1av of the NPPF (Aug 26) states that it is important to maintain an area's prevailing character. In the context of the policy this requirement is clearly deemed to out way the need to optimise the density of development on the site. The proposed development would constitute block development and urbanisation of the village and the Parish Council draws attention to the comments made by the Landscape Officer for application 23/00431. This is not appropriate development and offers nothing to the village.
- 2.8 The planning officer's advice concerning the withdrawal of application W/24/02405/FUL was based on SWDP13. This has now been replaced by SWDPR 16. The new policy is silent concerning development density in village locations. Indeed, a recently approved housing scheme

W/25/0189/FUL on the fringe of the village has a very low density with public open space and BNG provided alongside the development. This seems entirely contradictory to the proposal to provide 9 dwellings on such a cramped site. The parish council does not consider a densely packed development of this nature will enhance the character of the local area or improve the quality of the environment. Indeed, the development will destroy open countryside, impinge on neighbouring properties and exacerbate parking and transport issues in the village.

Residents have also highlighted the lack of visitor parking on site due to over development and consider that this will cause disruption and distress to the neighbourhood as visitors will park on the adjoining lanes where there is little ability to park without blocking access to established domestic drives.

Paragraph 16.5 of the Reasoned Justification to Policy SWDPR 16 also states that “It is important to consider the impact of development proposals on the character of the local area as well as the impact on the quality of new housing. Planning applications will need to demonstrate how the density of the surrounding area informs the scheme design and how the development proposal enhances the area.”

It is notable that there is no attempt to do this in the Planning Statement and in the judgment of the parish council the proposed development does not enhance the area in any way. In fact, this application would introduce an urban character that does not exist anywhere in Flyford Flavell today and thereby create demonstrable harm to the existing character of Flyford Flavell. This will be further exacerbated by the inclusion of four 3-storey houses, which are out of character with the 2-storey vernacular of the village.

- 2.9 Since the inception of the old SWDP, the housing stock in the parish has increased by 40%, however the sustainability of the village has deteriorated and is now a Category 2 village in the SWDPR. The village shop has closed and other services have a very uncertain future. Present bus services amount to the Redditch – Worcester service which passes by on the A422, 4 times a weekday and the Village Hopper service which is once a day. These are very intermittent services and frankly almost all inhabitants use their own transport. It is very unlikely that people of working age would be able to make use of these services and so would rely on their own transport. This does not meet the requirement of NPPF (aug26) TR3 para a that “the location should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car.”
- 2.10 The proposed development would encourage dependence on the motor car which is contrary to environmental policy of the local planning authority. SWDPR 06 seeks to limit the use of the private car and encourage other forms of sustainable transport. This application would result in much more dependence on the private car and is clearly in contradiction to LPA policy.
- 2.11 According to the government website – Impact, Flyford Flavell has a carbon

emissions of 30.8t CO₂e per household which is about twice the national average. 19% of this is due to travel. Again, this is a material consideration concerning the location of the site which is not sustainable.

3.0 Land Use

- 3.1 The land around Flyford Flavell is generally classed as Grade 3 agricultural land which is deemed to have “moderate limitations that affect the choice of crops to be grown, timing and type of cultivation, harvesting or yield.” The parish council consider this site to be of agricultural value and the loss of the land would outweigh the gain offered by the development. Until very recently there was ancient ridge and furrow on this site and it had therefore likely developed a very particular ecosystem which could include rare wildflowers and orchids. These are known to exist on the Portway Farm SSSI located 0.34km to the east, pasture behind Tolley’s Garage, The Piddle Brook Meadows and on the SSSI in Naunton Beachamp on North Piddle Lane. The site has recently been ploughed up and much of the ecosystem may have been lost. The site should be subject to a detailed ecological survey as part of the planning determination to see what can be salvaged. The site should be respected for what it is and in terms of the ‘Golden Thread of Sustainability’ it is best left alone as a location unsuitable for development because it was an environmental heritage site in the open countryside.
- 3.2 Recent developments in the village have offered tangible assets to the community. The village green was created in 2014 as a result of the provision of 16 houses. Four affordable houses were provided for the village, two of which are bungalows suitable for elderly people. The developments have either added to the sense of community or infilled in vacant gaps. This proposal does nothing of the sort. This is poor use of location and nothing is offered to the community.
- 3.3 SWDPR policy takes a very different line to development and seeks to concentrate housing into four strategic zones. In future there will be little reliance on development in unsustainable locations such as this application and therefore the concept is out of step with new, fully consulted policy.

4.0 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAAR)

- 4.1 The parish council notes that this site has been submitted through the SHLAAR process for inclusion as a development site in the SWDPR. Since that process housing for 14 houses has been approved on a site very close by. W/25/0189/FUL If the current application is approved that would give approval for a 20% increase in the size of the village with no improvement to facilities or infrastructure.

- 5.0 Should the planning officer be minded to approve this application the parish council respectfully asks our district member to refer the application to committee.
- 6.0 In the event that the application is approved the parish council request that a Construction Management Plan is applied as a condition to minimise noise and nuisance to neighbours. This plan should specifically ban any parking of construction vehicles on the public highway, as with careful planning, they could all be accommodated on the site. The Parish council also request that a pedestrian footway be constructed along the Bishampton road, as proposed in the application, and subject to a condition of no occupation prior to completion of the footway.