

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

**Minutes of the Meeting held at The Flyford's Hall  
on Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2026**

**Present** David Waide (Chairman) Sadie Densham  
Andrew Short Tracie Bluck  
Richard Croxton Tim Doughty  
Alison Crickmore

Mark Broughton-Taylor attended as clerk via Zoom

**1. Apologies**

Andrew Short  
Linda Robinson - District and County Councillor

**2. Declaration of Interest:**

Andrew Short declared a pecuniary interest in item 4i and David Waide declared an interest in the same item.

**3. Public Participation**

Ten members of the public were in attendance. Several contributors took the opportunity to express their dismay at the recent approval of application for 14 houses despite copious objections from the public and the Parish Council. The Parish Council stated that it was taking legal advice about the decision and further details would be available at the scheduled meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> March.

There was unanimous concern about the Planning In Principle application on the agenda which was to be discussed later. A show of hands indicated there was unanimous opposition to this application.

Concern was raised that approval of the application at Stedefield could set a precedent for further development behind the properties on Church Lane. It was also noted that the agent relied heavily on the previous PIP approval on this site even though that approval had now lapsed.

**4. Planning Matters - To formulate comments:**

i **Application Number : W/26/00296/FUL  
Location: Stedefield,  
Church Lane,  
Flyford Flavell,  
Worcester,**

**WR7 4BZ**

**Description of Proposal: Construction of a self-build 3 bedroom dwelling following approved planning in principal application. PIP reference: W/22/02456/PIP**

**Applicant : Mr & Mrs Andrew & Fiona Short**

This application was discussed after the PIP application and David Waide absented himself due to his declaration of interest. Tim Doughty was appointed as chair for this item.

Following discussion an objection was agreed. (Please note the exact wording was communicated to councillors the following day by the clerk).

The parish council supports the public objections to this application which have been made on the Wychavon website and at a public meeting held on 3rd March 2026.

It is noted that heavy reliance is given to the PIP application that precedes this in the planning statement.

However, the PIP has now lapsed and this is a Full application. The parish council does not therefore consider the precedent of the PIP to carry any weight.

The parish council note that the listed privy has been demolished but consider that this application affects the setting of a listed building and would be grateful for an explanation why the LPA does not require a listed building application to accompany the Full application.

The parish council wishes to be consistent in its approach to potential development in the village and considers this proposal to be out of character with the neighbouring properties and the general housing stock of the village contrary to the Village Design Statement.

The village has a linear form and this is not considered infill but back land development which would set a precedent for the village allowing similar further development contrary to the historic development of the village.

Should the planning officer be minded to recommend approval of this application the parish council ask that the local member request that it is taken to planning committee for final decision.

- ii **Application Number : W/26/00358/PIP**  
**Location: Land At (OS 9822 5498),**  
**Radford Road,**  
**Flyford Flavell**

**Description of Proposal: Permissions in Principle for the construction of up to 9no. dwellings**

**Applicant : SEI Holdings Ltd**

Following discussion and a draft comment which had been circulated to councillors prior to the meeting the following comment was agreed. (Please note again the exact wording was circulated to councillors the following day).

1/. INTRODUCTION

This is the official comment from the Flyford Flavell, Grafton Flyford and North Piddle Parish Council.

- 1.i The parish council opposes this application for very much the same reasons that it opposed application 22/02163, 23/00431 and 23/01134 which were all lost on appeal. (Appeals 3329615,3326919 and 3329178) It is also noted that this application comes immediately after the approval of application 25/01891/FUL which the parish council vehemently opposed. It is also a concern that the application comes a few weeks before the introduction of revised policy which will be less favorable to the application. Accordingly, the Parish Council emphasizes the following objections concerning the location and sustainability of the site and the proposal.

- 1.ii The Parish Council also considers that all planning applications should be judged on policy lines and not on the basis of planning approvals which have been made against policy. In the case of planning application No 25/01891/FUL on neighbouring land which was recently approved there is no policy justification for the decision and it should not be used as a precedent. The parish council believes that the LPA has exceeded its powers in granting this permission and is reviewing options to have the approval quashed.

2/. AMOUNT OF DEVELOPMENT

- 2.i The density of the development is not in keeping with the surroundings and would have a detrimental effect on the visual amenity of the area. It would extend beyond the present boundary of the village but create a green gap where in time it would be difficult to resist further development. The application is vague about the number of units intended for the site. On a site of 0.45 hectares between 4 and 9 units is a significant difference and more clarity is required.

### 3 LOCATION

- 3.i A justification is made that Flyford Flavell is a category 2 village and so the criteria can be extended to this site. The parish council wish to point out that since the inception of the SWDP, Flyford has lost some of its facilities and no longer meets the criteria for category 2 status. Notwithstanding this, the site is outside the village boundary and should not be connected with the village for planning purposes. It is also noted that in the Village hierarchy in the emerging SWDP, Flyford Flavell has been downgraded to a category 3 village. (Emerging SWDP Annex A page 329). It is only right that the more up to date information in this area should be used as the original is now more than 10 years out of date.
- 3.ii There is very poor drainage in the area and the opportunities for dealing with foul water waste is limited. (The Flyford Flavell sewage system is presently overloaded). The Parish Council does not know of any water course or other means of disposing of grey water from this site. It is restricted in size and the development of up to 9 houses would certainly mean there is no room for percolation of the waste water on site. The Parish Council considers this to be a material consideration in determining whether the location of the site is suitable.
- 3.iii 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 consider this a material consideration in determining the suitability of the location of the site.
- 3.iv 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 linear 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.
- 3.v Since the inception of the present SWDP the housing stock in the parish has increased by 40%, however the sustainability of the village has deteriorated. The village shop and church have 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.
- 3.vi 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. Again, this is a material consideration concerning the location of the site.

- 3.vii The parish council held an open meeting for residents to express their concerns about application 22/02163 and a further public meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2026. A considerable number of people highlighted the issue of parking in the village. There is a primary school very close to the proposed development site and it is now over subscribed. Amongst other issues this creates a very real traffic problem in the village with cars parked along the lane and in the vicinity of the school. Further development along here without the requisite infrastructure improvements is going to exacerbate an already fraught situation which would create a danger to school pupils and members of the public.
- 3.viii 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 3 to 5 more bungalows. 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.ix The applicant suggests that a social need can be met by providing much needed housing. The numbers of housing proposed is too vague to make a true assessment of this criteria. With the threshold of the provision of affordable housing being 4 units, this application deliberately sets out to hedge the developer's bets and so leave a commercial decision which has a direct bearing on the social sustainability of the site until a later date. This makes it impossible to form a firm decision and thus undermines the sustainability of the proposal.
- 3.x This is a remote site for elderly people who are likely to have impaired mobility and will almost certainly rely on the motor car contrary to the SWDP policy. A walk to the local shop on the A422 entails a round trip of 1.2 miles along lanes without footways, a steep hill and a busy A road where the footway is on the opposite side of the road. It can be noted here that the increase in housing in Flyford Flavell has not lead to any community transport initiatives or demand-responsive forms of transport and we see no prospect of anything developing in the near or medium future. This is a material consideration concerning the location of the site.

## 4 LAND USE

- 4.i 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. It is known locally that this particular field has not been ploughed for about 40 years. It has 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. At the very least the site should be subject to a detailed ecological survey as part of the planning determination. The Parish Council does not accept the term ‘redundant’ as the site is referred to in the Planning Statement but on the contrary, this is an important ecological field that forms part of the open countryside. 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 is an environmental heritage site in the open countryside.
- 4.ii The hedgerows are also known to have been undisturbed for a considerable length of time. The hedge on the opposite side of the road, belonging to the Parish Council is dominated by elm, hawthorn and blackthorn and scores 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.
- 4.iii The Parish Council also note the comments made by the Worcestershire Archaeologist for application 23/0431 and echo his concerns about Roman remains that may be on this site. The P C is aware of recent finds of Roman artefacts at The Old Post Office which is the property adjacent to the proposed site.

## 5 FIVE YEAR LAND SUPPLY

- 5.i In paragraph 4.3 - 5 of the Planning Statement the applicant refers to the lack of a 5 year land supply. 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.

## 6 LOCAL ISSUES

- 6.i 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. It seeks to create disjointed ribbon development and provide isolated dwellings which will be dislocated from the village. Nothing is offered to the community and there is a vagueness about numbers which means no commitment is being made concerning affordable housing.
- 6.ii It is also noted that a PIP and Outline Application in the neighbouring village of Dormston have recently been refused. These were very similar in their speculative nature and are a precedent for this application. W/25/01975/PIP (9 Houses) and W/25/01659/OUT (6 houses).

## 7 EMERGING POLICY

- 7.i The parish council is aware that emerging policy for South Worcestershire is almost ready for adoption. This policy takes a very different line to development and seeks to concentrate housing into three 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.

## 8 COMMITTEE

- 8.i Should the planning officer be minded to approve this application the parish council respectfully ask our district member to refer the application to committee.

## 18. Any Other Business

None

## Date of Next Meeting

31<sup>st</sup> March 2026

Signed:

Date:

DRAFT