

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

**Minutes of the Meeting held at Flyford Flavell Church
on Wednesday 30th July 2025**

Present David Waide (Chairman) Sadie Densham
Andrew Short
Richard Croxton

Linda Robinson - District and County Councillor

Mark Broughton-Taylor attended as clerk

1. Apologies

Alison Crickmore

2. Declaration of Interest:

Alison Crickmore

3. Public Participation:

Sixteen residents from Flyford Flavell attended the meeting to voice concerns about the recent planning application for Meadowcroft detailed below.

4. Planning Application

Mr J Broderick

W/25/01449/FUL

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

**Construction of 9no. dwellings following Permission in
Principle W/23/01778/PIP**

Mr Broderick was in attendance and was asked to outline the planning application which was under discussion.

Mr Broderick had received advice from the planning officer following the submission of a planning application last year for 4 houses that the density of the submission did not equate with present Wychavon planning policy and that it was not an economic and efficient use of land. As the site had been allocated for 12 houses and the PIP approval was for up to nine houses he was advised to withdraw the application and resubmit for more houses. This application is a result of that advice.

He advised that there was a problem trying to find a suitable agency to take on the affordable housing allocation on the site but he had proceeded with the application nonetheless.

The application consisted of 3 mews houses, 3 - 3 bedroom and 3 - 4 bedroom houses.

He noted that there were other imminent applications due in the village and that this was the only site that had been allocated for development by Wychavon in their call for sites exercise (SHELAA).

5. Following Mr Broderick's presentation the chairman opened up the discussion for public comment. A summary of the comments is presented below:
 1. Concern was raised that as the applicant had acted on advice from the planning officer this was a 'done deal' and it was not worth commenting.
 2. Further comment was made that the system was 'corrupt' and that the application should go to committee for transparency of procedure.
 3. Concern was raised that the title of the application had changed. Initially it was called **Meadow Croft, Bishampton Road, Flyford Flavell, WR7 4BT** But it had been changed to **Land At (OS 9819 5481) Bishampton Road Flyford Flavell**
This had led to confusion in the village and it was considered that the consultation was flawed as a result.
 4. Parking was raised as an issue by several members of the public who considered that there were not enough parking spaces on the site for visitors and that the development would exacerbate parking difficulties that already existed in the village.
 5. The issue of drainage was raised with a number of close neighbours raising the issue of lying water in the grounds of houses along Bishampton Road.
 6. The access to the site was raised as a concern. It appeared from the drawings that the access was only 1.8m wide and concerns about two way traffic into the development and access for emergency vehicles and bin lorries was raised.
 7. The applicant was asked what the development provided for the village in terms of enhanced services or amenities.
 8. It was noted that the curtilage of the affordable houses were very small, about half the size of the affordable houses on the green.
 9. The provision of services such as electricity, sewage and water were raised as these were seen to be either in short supply or over subscribed in the area.

Following the comment the chairman asked for a show of hands to see what support there was for the application.

There was one in favour and 15 against.

6. Parish Council Discussion

Following the comments from the public the chairman closed the meeting for open discussion and proceeded with a discussion of the application between the parish councillors to prepare a statement.

Councillors considered that the proposal was over development for the site and that it would result in unacceptable urbanisation in the village. They considered that the planning officer was incorrect in her advice concerning the present policy and that she had not given full weight to SWDP 13 paragraphs B & C which states that development should enhance the character and quality of the local area, commensurate with a viable scheme and infrastructure capacity. Furthermore, the policy 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."

On this basis the parish council resolved to oppose that application and to base its comment on the previous submission for development on this site.

The clerk was asked to formulate the final comment which would be circulated to councillors for final approval before submission.

The resolution was proposed by:

David Waide, seconded by Andrew Short and all were in favour.

17. Date of Next Meeting

October 21st 2025.

Signed:

Date:

The full text of the submission made by the Parish Council is as follows:

Flyford Flavell, Grafton Flyford and North Piddle Parish Council

W/25/01449/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 public meeting was held at Flyford Flavell Parish Church on 30th July 2025. The applicant was given the opportunity to present the application.
- 1.2 Concern was raised by members of the public concerning the change of name of the application. The notification to the parish council stated the application was at Meadow Croft but the website has the address as land at Bishampton Road as above. 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. 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 consider this to be appropriate development for the site and the village.
- 2.3 The entrance to the site is off Bishampton Lane in a sensitive and central location in the village. It will be difficult to create visibility splays on both sides

of the entrance and 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 draw 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. A pumping station was built for foul water but it is difficult to see how foul water could be drained from this site. Without detailed consideration of these issues the parish council deems that the location of the site can not be approved.
- 2.5 Para 50 of the NPPF 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 Furthermore the applicant has not been able to find any housing association to take on the affordable housings allocation for this site. This suggests that affordable housing is not required in this location.
- 2.7 Para 64 of the NPPF requires that permission should be refused for development that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. The P C does not consider that this application improves the character and quality of the area. The development would constitute block development in 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. However, the parish council does not consider that the advice gave due weight to Paragraphs B & C of SWDP 13 which states that development should enhance the character and quality of the local area, commensurate with a viable scheme and infrastructure capacity. 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 4 of the Reasoned Justification to Policy SWDP 13 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 the Planning Statement and in the judgment of the parish council the proposed development does not enhance the area in any way.

- 2.9 Since the inception of the present SWDP, the housing stock in the parish has increased by 30%, however the sustainability of the village has deteriorated. 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.
- 2.10 The proposed development would encourage dependence on the motor car which is contrary to environmental policy of the local planning authority. SWDP 4 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.
- 2.12 The planning statement argues that the thread of sustainable development as envisaged in the NPPF is met by this proposal. That is the economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainability. The parish council begs to differ. As previously stated, the area cannot see any discernible economic benefit from the development in the village over the past ten years and sees no reason why this should change because of the development of 9 more dwellings. Furthermore, there are very few opportunities for employment in the village and surrounding area and anyone of working age is likely to need to travel to work by car.

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 The hedgerows are also known to have been undisturbed for a considerable length of time. The hedges are dominated by elm, hawthorn and blackthorn and score a high value of +2 for natural conservation when assessed with the HEGS criteria. Again, the parish council would suggest that a full ecological report on the hedgerows is required before determination of this application.
- 3.3 Recent developments in the village have offered tangible assets to the community. The village green was created in 2016 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.
- 3.4 The parish council is aware that emerging policy for South Worcestershire has now been presented to the inspector. This 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.
- 3.5 The parish council does not consider that there is safe pedestrian access to the site and village. There is no footway along the carriageway and the grass verges are limited and uneven.

4.0 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAAR)

- 4.1 The parish council noted that this site has been submitted through the SHLAAR process for inclusion as a development site in the RSWDP. The applicant argues that it is not premature to make this application, partly because in the delay of adopting the RSWDP but also because of the lack of 5 year land supply in the Wychavon area. The parish council rejects this argument for the following reasons:
- 4.2 The parish council understand that the 5 year land supply for Wychavon has technically defaulted but the overall situation is complicated. Overall, the South Worcestershire Councils have a five year land supply of 5.76 years but under the standard method, Wychavon is not allowed to take into account the

oversupply in the past few years. The applicant quotes selectively from the December 2022 Five Year Land Supply Report. The SWDP area has overall provided 15,980 completions since 2013 against a requirement of 11,172. Furthermore, Wychavon proposed that a number of windfall sites should be included in the 5 year land supply figures. In 2021-2022 Wychavon predicated 82 dwellings on sites of less than 10 units but in reality 140 completions were delivered. The Parish Council understands that where a 5 year land supply cannot be demonstrated then decisions should be taken on the basis of sustainability under the NPPF. As stated in para 9 above, the village has seen considerable development over the past few years with a reduction in sustainability. Increasing housing on its own does not increase sustainability and there has been no increase in services or infrastructure in or around the village as a result of the recent development. Given the fact that there is no pressure on the area as a whole to deliver more housing – there are 4808 more houses than planned and an oversupply of windfall sites in particular- the parish council cannot see how this proposed development improves the overall need for housing. Given the high emissions per household as stated in paragraph 2.9 it would seem that permitting development in Flyford Flavell would exacerbate not improve the sustainability picture in Wychavon.

- 4.3 In any case, adoption as a possible development site in the emerging policy does not immediately translate into permission in principle. The process is a lot less vigorous than the planning system and is more about allocating sites to ensure a supply of development through the plan period. On examination of this site in detail, the parish council considers that it is not suitable for the level of development proposed. The principle has been examined on many occasions in the past and has been rejected twice on appeal. There is no reason at all why development is needed on this site and there are plenty of other more sustainable sites in Wychavon for suitable development to take place.
- 5.0 Should the planning officer be minded to approve this application the parish council respectfully ask our district member to refer the application to committee.