

Bayston Hill Community Responses to October/November Oakland & Glebe land draft planning brief  
and associated documents

Thank you to all residents who commented about the Oakland & Glebeland draft development brief and associated documents. Ninety six comments and four letters were received throughout the period of consultation. Thank you for taking the time to make your opinions known.

To ensure anonymity for those that responded, the post codes have been jumbled to ensure individual postcodes cannot be associated with individual comments. Also, to protect those that mentioned where they lived in their comments, this information has been removed.

All email addresses have been collated and will be used to ensure residents receive a copy of this feedback.

*David Fairclough, Community Enablement Officer, Shropshire Council*

SY3 OHY	SY3 ONF	SY3 ONA	SY3 OEW	SY3 OQB
SY3 6AN	SY3 OPS	SY3 OHZ	SY3 OND	SY3 OPX
SY3 ONH	SY3 OEZ	SY3 OPR	SY3 OEX	
SY2 5PF	SY3 OJH	SY3 ONU	SY3 OLB	
SY3 ODR	SY3 OPY	SY5 8EX	SY3 OPJ	
SY3 OPT	SY3 OQQ	SY3 OEA	SY3 OPW	
SY3 OPL	SY3 OHP	SY3 OAN	SY3 OPN	
SY3 OQF	SY3 OQA	SY3 OHJ	SY3 5EX	

Community Responses:

1. Is there any reason why the proposed open space and proposed housing area could not be transposed? The impact on all existing houses surrounding the site would be significantly reduced if this happened

The designated housing land is in the worst possible area of the site from my own point of view. I will directly overlook houses when I hoped I would be looking over open space. If the houses are to be where shown, they should be low level bungalows. It is a shame that yet another area of open green space is being lost to development. I fear for our future generations. I will object strongly.

The main sewer is in the housing area. 1) Has capacity of the sewer been checked? (Many houses are just downstream of the proposed development) 2) Building over a sewer is not allowed, will the sewer be moved? Is the Glebefield in particular a designated sports field? If so, have Sport England been consulted over its loss? I am sure they will have strong feelings. The glebe has held organised spontaneous events and hosted local clubs for many years.

If houses are built as shown on the concept plan, will a suitable boundary be planted to prevent existing properties off Lyth Hill Road being overlooked? This should be an essential part of any future development if it happens.

One point I forgot to make at the meeting was related to all the surrounding very mature, probably protected trees along the boundary of the school and Glebefield at the back of the Lyth Hill Road houses. These trees will have very extensive root systems extending a long distance into the development site? What assurance will be given that the construction work planned will not cause serious damage to these magnificent trees? Is this not another reason to reconfigure the site moving the construction element of the site as far away as possible from the boundary?

2. Very poor preparation for such an important LJC meeting!
3. Where can we walk our dogs and let our children run safely as we do now. I use the field every day for outdoor activities where the children can run freely and we can walk to the field without having to use the car.
4. It would be good if a similar development as Holland Close (for older single people) was built which may release some of the larger houses for sale. Couldn't the Post Office move to the new hub when it is built? How are we going to get to Lythwood Road from Yew Tree Drive, Lyndhurst Drive?
5. (Aimed at the Parish Council) Please keep the lease! Close and move the library to Oakfield
6. Why do we need more community rooms, we have enough already. Put Clerk in Library and Scouts up in Lythwood. We need elderly housing!
7. The extra traffic that the new development will bring plus, where will the cars park when visiting the library scouts hut as the Church Car Park is always full and visitors to the Church Park along the roads. Have you thought about the 100 or so extra cars on Glebe Road from residents of the proposed houses and their visitors? This is in addition to the present parking problems.
8. How many areas are available for walking with dogs / open space for general use?
9. Firstly I am encouraged by the amount of green space and hope that it is protected in future plans. Secondly, the prospect of affordable housing for young people and first time buyers is a great one. As a couple with a young baby, being able to have a security of property is unobtainable at present so we would welcome a new development.
10. More field space and a social room / café / gym. I hate it because they're taking away our field. I think that they should make a gym, or café out of the old School instead of making another Library.
11. As a local resident I am looking forward to an end to the anti-social behaviour in the current car park. I feel the community hub will poster a greater service for the community. The Church will be even better placed to service many in the community through café-type facilities. I whole heartedly support the developments.
12. Save the trees and plants! Thinking what might happen, I think it will be good for the children because it will be much safer, better, more fun and brighter and people will love it. I love the idea of the playground. People will let more children out, and the streets will be full of laughter once more.
13. The memorial area could be re-designed in a circular or oval shape which could have small trees which would give it a more peaceful ambience, perhaps with some seating?

14. We believe this field should stay as it is to offer greenery to the front as you already have a car park for the Church. However, if it were to become the new car park, it needs to have secure parking so gate is closed at night as there are always people parking and meeting on Church car park (boy racers to be precise). We also feel the new car park should retain trees and hedges to be private and aesthetically pleasing. There should also be traffic calming as people drive too fast along Glebe Road
15. I'd like to see the Post Office included in the hub site
16. A practical idea - How about using the open space that will be created for dog training sessions. This will encourage the community. There could be a space for dogs ashes in the memorial area
17. Looking at the current library site, the community hub looks much smaller and will have to house 3 different bodies. Will the library space be greatly reduced?
18. I live in Bayston Hill and have been to the planning meeting on the proposed plans for the school and glebe land. I realize that it is quite complicated issue and have no comments over that. The reason I am writing this is the proposal of so many 'affordable houses'. To my mind sine of the space would be better used for assisted living apartments for our senior citizens who are planning to downsize and don't want to move out of the area, as indeed move twice. They would have the security of knowing help at land when needed etc. While living in their own homes.
19. This looks good. Great that it's going to be for all the community and not just lots more houses. How many houses? Will the School be big enough
20. Just make sure you leave some green area for kids etc. There'll be no going back if you don't and it will be a crime. It would have been nice to have been completed in this way earlier before as much seemed already decided – Still not too late I hope.
21. Having just seen the plans of the development at our soon to disappear Post Office, I am appalled to see that the new library will only be half its present size. The present building is too small to provide a good range of books and should be much bigger and include a computer/Wi-Fi hub. How many parking spaces at present and how many are being proposed?
22. Sports and leisure centre with spa, café, picnic area, restaurant, play area for children.
23. A playground for young children this side of the village.
24. Maybe change the old School to a supermarket or an indoor fun house with a Café off to the side
25. And the Scout & Guide HQ? Defunct? Shame about the reduced playing field Shame about the housing.
26. No 3 storey houses. TPO's on ALL trees at rear of Lyth Hill Road properties. Retention of existing boundaries.
27. Good to see a proposed scheme maximising open space & affordable housing. Groups of all ages from Bayston Hill community already use the Church facilities, so good to see library and children's play area nearby for them to use too. Would be good to see some seating in/near the existing memorial garden so that people can enjoy this space (especially the elderly). It would be good if the current Orchard could be preserved as a community facility.

28. Will the young people of the area be consulted about the play area? Have all permissions been granted for demolish the old school? E.g. DFE and Secretary of State?
29. If the project goes ahead, it would be good to consider a pull in at the front of the Church for loading/unloading. Re Garden of remembrance, twice the area that is currently laid out and bordered is consecrated ground. The size of this would need to be clarified should this area be adjacent to the shared car park. Good lighting on the shared car park would be essential.
30. I believe this proposed development if adopted will benefit the whole community
31. This looks like a well-considered and sensitive development which would potentially enhance the area – providing much needed housing, a children’s play area and a hub – all in one place. It would benefit the village.
32. I am concerned that the proposed site of the extension to Church building could cover the area where my parents and others ashes and. This area was used prior to the memorial site.
33. In principle I am in support of the proposed, however, from a personal point of view I have the following concerns: The planning brief does not stipulate the size of the open space, I was informed in Church that it was in excess of the minimum amount required, this size should be stated in the brief document. The brief also does not make it clear that there should be trees and hedgerow along the western boundary adjacent to Eric Locke road west, it needs to. The planning brief states that a standoff should be maintained between the developments & existing properties, however, it does not state what this standoff should be as a minimum in distance, we feel it should. The planning brief does not exclude the building of a 3 storey dwelling; we would ask that it does.
34. We can make our plans but the Lord determines our steps – Proverbs 16v9; In all your ways acknowledge him and he will make your paths straight – Proverbs 3v6; All a man’s ways seem innocent to him but motives are weighed by the Lord – Proverbs 16v2
35. Not enough green area in centre of village. Sufficient services? Dentist, Dr’s etc.? Problems with access for cars & traffic generally. Car parking on Glebe Rd now almost 24/7 – very bad. I ride on a bus – route address to traffic problems
36. I am concerned about the size of the library compared to the Church, it looks very small. I do not think the library can be any smaller than it is now. I bring groups of pupils from the local School and they need space and a good choice of materials. With a children’s playground outside, the library will attract more customers. A café / room for people with children to sit and have a snack would be a good addition.
37. Drainage is a problem on this site, we now have flooding from the area every time we have rain or snow and it pours across the road, flooding it. We have had flooding in to our garage (which I have photos of) you need to take in to consideration.
38. I strongly oppose the proposed opening on to Church land to be used as a car park for the library & church etc. as on occasions when they have used it for parking we have found that the cars drive out right opposite our large front windows, and their headlights dazzle us in the room, and shine on our TV and this is invasion of our privacy, also it is dangerous access (we have witnessed a couple of accidents there) as it is near the junction coming off Christchurch Drive, and it also on a bend .

39. I like the playground idea. Wondering how big the housing is going to be?
40. My chief objection to the development of this site is the Glebe Field, and it's that this is a green site in the centre of the village where children can run around and kick a ball about. It is the only place for young children and their parents. The playing fields at the top of the village are more for teenagers. It is also used for frequently by dog walkers. Has there been any count done as to the number of people who use this field? This is a very valuable green area and should be preserved. Once it's gone, it is lost forever.
41. The library looks tiny!
42. Would like to see self-build plots as part of housing, a good size children's playground, larger library, Shops – the Parade is not an attractive focus for Bayston Hill.
43. The current proposal is a big improvement on the first draft. A big effort has been made to extend the green areas that are to remain. Only concerns are access on to Eric Locke Road and the possible objection from 'Sport England' regarding loss of playing space.
44. Would it be worthwhile to organise a survey of those people who regularly walk their dogs on the Glebe land to find out what percentage arrive by car? Those who do are not seriously going to be inconvenienced by using alternative dog walking areas.
45. Need to protect trees at rear to 72-96 Lyth Hill Road. Also, need to clarify responsibility for fencing at rear of 96 Lyth Hill Rd down to number 72 (i.e. existing fence line). Type of housing to be only two storey levels (ground and one more) i.e. restrict visual impact from Lyth Hill road gardens & limit overlook issue.
46. We would love to see something done with the 2 open porches at the Church to stop the ASB. We would like it if there were gates or some form of barrier to the car parks to stop joy riders. Hopefully it will be tarmacked and lined for better parking. Also, drainage for water coming off the existing and proposed new car park.
47. I would like to point out we are all in our retirement years, so this will be very stressful for us. The problems for us are the parking outside our house, the new extension to the Church, the picket fencing is rubbish. Could you not build a low wall around the Church? Car parking needs hard surfacing it's been a disgrace for years with water running down Christ Church Drive like a stream.
48. As this is potentially quite a large development, I feel, in view of the large number of elderly people in the village, it would be only right to allocate an area for sheltered housing. This could be a very tasteful and well thought out site, especially as the facilities of the village of the library are on hand. A hub here could provide social activities and the Church is nearby where there is quite a lot going on for older people.
49. If the development of the land is going to be an advantage to the village, surely the library should be larger? There are many activities that take place in libraries of reading groups, literacy events, children's literature activities plus internet access and much more. Surely it should be larger than needed at the moment, to accommodate future use, especially as the increase in houses will increase the population. Why Hub? It doesn't seem much of a hub to me!

50. Do we need yet another Parish Office – if so, relocate to the Shopping Parade. The Library I agree with. Do we need more community space – we have 2 Churches with halls, a youth building, the memorial hall and large primary School with two halls? Is the Church full every Sunday to need a new layout and further accommodation? Improve whose car park provision for the benefit of whom? We already have a public car park on Glebe Road! Relocate the Scouts and Guides to where? Has this site and have costings been discussed? How many residents are there in homes in each use is made of existing opportunities for the residents? Open space – interesting use of the word ‘will’. I assume this presumes it will all happen and therefore is today yet a further meaningless exercise? We will lose the last green land in the centre of the village at a time of ageing populations and increase in childhood obesity – real waste. Ecology, ‘There are therefore no known flood risks from water courses – again interesting given comments made by one of the people at the outset of the consultation. How much more land does the Church own and where is it in the village?
51. Regarding the above , I would like to be informed please of the plans for; Water supply route, Storm water route & sewer route - It is widely believed in the village of Bayston Hill that the infrastructure concerning water and it' disposal currently operates at its limit. Your comments and a drawing/plan of the proposal relating to this would be useful and I would appreciate it if such could be forwarded to me.
52. Having attended the meeting concerning this development we are strongly concerned over the closure of the Library and re-siting it on the Glebe field site, a currently well subscribed to library. We strongly object to the proposed development of a Housing plan on this very small piece of land (where Library currently is), which is right on the corner of two very busy highways i.e. Lythwood Road and Glebe road. Also the close proximity of housing to our property something that we would object to very strongly if indeed planning acceptance was approved.
53. There is a large retired population in Bayston Hill, many, we suspect, living in homes too large but not wanting to leave the area. We think it would be of all round benefit to have more bungalows and sheltered accommodation. The current library site would be ideal for this type of property which requires only small gardens and limited parking. Low profile bungalows being in keeping with the bungalows and cottages in the immediate vicinity.
54. A real need for supervised sheltered accommodation for the elderly in bungalows. This could help free other housing in the village. Any new housing should be aimed at helping people get on the housing ladder. Expensive luxury homes do little to solve the housing problems of the younger generation. Has an approach been made to Beeches medical practice for them to build a first class medical centre for the village?
55. I think that there should be no development here and that the development should instead be done on a Greenfield site beyond the edge of the village. The existing playing fields are needed by the community.
56. This appears a fabulous opportunity for the village, establishing a focused community area and spaces that would provide valued clubs a place to belong
57. The area next to the bungalows 60-64 Lyth Hill Rd – if used for housing the buildings should be either bungalows or far enough away so that they do not overlook the existing buildings.

58. Hello. Having viewed the map and read the proposals for the site, to be a community hub, initially looks good. It appears Christ Church will give land, now grass, for a car park. The Oakland site is in need of something to be done there. However, I am confused as to why the Diocese feels it necessary to offer the Glebe land – maybe greed? I'm concerned that if a developer gets this land, greed will result in a vast amount of houses being erected (I have been told 60) and as at Fox Close there will end up being buy to let (greed). Although I see a small green area and children's play area on the map – is this a guarantee?? How much green space will be left or again will greed take over? It appears that housing land will be very close to the existing houses which as a local resident seems not only intimidating but also unfair. Thank you for hearing my comments.
59. We all realise there has to be change, as long as we can believe the planners that will keep their word and the development includes Scouts and Guides building and Library & Playground.
60. I like the idea of a new library and community centre, parish office etc. Make sure it is big enough to accommodate all of these activities especially the library. I am concerned about access and how many houses (and therefore cars and people) will use this one access point. Why are all the built areas backing on to existing housing?
61. North East boundary – please take into consideration any housing near this boundary needs to be no more than one storey high in order to maintain privacy of adjoining bungalows.
62. It is my opinion that the parish council has failed in its obligation to the residents of Bayston Hill regarding the proposed sale of the Glebe field. The lease on the field has 5 more years to run, but it has never been properly discussed at meetings. You have allowed the church to dictate what should happen, in my opinion the parish council is out of touch with the views of the majority of Bayston Hill residents as made clear last November and again on the 30th September regarding the sale of the Glebe field.
63. What is going to happen with the electrical transformer in the school grounds? Access will be required for maintenance; houses would not be near this transformer.
64. How big is the new library? On the map it looks about half the size of the existing library. If this is true it is a disgrace! Why not turn the old infant school into new community information/ library centre. Oh sorry would that eat into the greedy developers profits. What is the role of the church in all of this?
65. I would strongly advise the retention of "A" category trees and especially the retention veteran oak trees on the boundary of? Land. It would be vandalism not to pressure them
66. Please inform me of next meeting when I can object to this disgraceful plan!
67. I totally oppose it.
68. Do not build on the Glebefield.
69. I think it is the worst thing! EVER!
70. Bad, rubbish, revolting
71. I hate it!
72. Build loads of homes!

73. There are enough houses in Bayston Hill without any more we only have two roads out! What a shame we are having more!
74. The project must include community use – library – clubs/scouts etc. As an ageing village I think affordable housing (for young people) and bungalows or sheltered accommodation for the elderly. There is sufficient larger family homes and if the village is to expand for children (i.e. Schools) etc. This is preferable.
75. Would want consideration given to increased traffic in this area – traffic entrances/exits to development? Lyth Hill Rd is effectively a cul-de-sac what goes up comes back the same way, very little goes down the narrow lane onto the A49 off the top of the hill. Already congested when buses encounter the Lorries, delivery and removal trucks
76. Why is this plan not showing any roads leading in/ out of the estate/ area?
77. This is good for us and the environment.
78. I am glad that some open space has been provided but dismayed that the amount is so small. Such a large housing development means that Bayston Hill is in danger of losing its identity as a village and becoming more like a built up township, to the detriment of the large number of us who live around or near the Glebefield. There should be a greater balance between housing and open space. The proposals are far too heavily weighted in favour of housing and the environment will suffer.
- The children's play area is a welcome addition and I am pleased to see that resident's opinions have been listened to with regard to some community facilities on the Oakland site. However, I feel that the older generation needs facilities to help them to continue talking, walking exercise rather than sit passively in a cut-off area. A few benches dotted around the open – and hopefully larger – public space would be much more beneficial for the older generation to encourage more walking activity.
- I am also concerned about the extra traffic and possibly the increased difficulties joining the A49. Plus – are local facilities, particularly doctors, sufficient to accommodate a considerable number of extra inhabitants?
- Finally why is it necessary to enhance the existing planted boundary at the back of York House? I walked past it yesterday and the existing planted boundary seems quite adequate and any further planting would eat into the planned open space.
79. Having carefully studied the concept plan I am in favour of certain elements of it, namely a community hub, library etc. On the old Oakland site + a children's play area behind and housing on the school field area behind that. More housing will inevitably increase the number of children and a play area for them will be very desirable. However I am strongly opposed to housing development on the Glebefield, on the contrary this green space will become even more precious with more development nearby and should be enhanced as a recreational area e.g. seating and shrubs planted to make it more attractive. A haven of peace and relaxation in such a busy and developed area. In my opinion green spaces are essential for this purpose and should be guarded and protected as such. I have lived in the village for many years and this has always been a green space for public use and should continue so. Maybe the parish council should consider purchasing it when the lease expires in 6 years.
80. The area if it has to be built on should have density mixed housing for young and old requirements with open area for walking and a modern play space unlike the old out of date space. The housing



should have solar panels; the library should be included in this space with short stay parking spaces and a communal room.

81. I am disgusted at the idea of losing the Glebefield, I came here nearly 40 years ago and I have a family with grandchildren – open spaces needed here. Not at top of village, the church is greedy! Why does the church need this so called extra tree boundary “planted” – will only take up more of green space. Just keep the lovely trees we’ve already got!
82. It must be remembered that the Glebefield is the only open access land in this part of Bayston hill and must be preserved mainly for this purpose. There must be provision of a space large enough for children to run and play, not merely to be confined to static play equipment. More than “dog walkers” use the Glebefield; my children and grandchildren have for over 30 years played informal games there and we have found great enjoyment together.

The area marked in green includes other areas not in any way ‘open Access’ and this is misleading. The definitive area to be allocated as open access land must be stated. This is very important as I see from the tree inventory map that the proposed green space is shown as different shaped area. Contrary to what is said in the planning brief there are public rights of way and these are shown on old maps. This error must be admitted.

The proposal to count open field along yew tree drive is not acceptable because the very open nature alongside open countryside would require that children need to be closely supervised. Thereby preventing them from having the freedom of open air creative play with their peers. The brief mentions the open area as a focus for the new properties. This will lead to perceptions of territorial rights, what is needed is to protest what is there for the rest of the villagers in this area and must be demanded in the further detailed plans to follow.

83. It is good that some open public space is proposed together with a play area. However, at a mere 25% compared with 75% allocated for housing, this is hardly generous. It certainly does not reflect the strength of local opinion which was established last November and re-confirmed on 30 September. A lot of people who live in this central area of the village have benefitted from green space for 40 years and expected to see a better allocation than this.

The over use of green colouring on the plan to include private land is deliberately misleading, designed to trick people into thinking that more open space has been provided than is actually the case. Can we have a more responsible attitude and more honest plan, please?

As a village, Bayston Hill can’t sustain a major new housing development of this size. If there is a guidance level of 50-60 more houses up to 2026, as made clear in the planning brief and 33 are already in the pipeline for the Pulley Lane development (within the parish boundary), there is clearly scope for less housing and more public space on the Oakland/ Glebe field site. Linked to this point, there is a strong case for low density, well-spaced housing?

This implies a need for a quality developer, capable of ensuring an open, tasteful development which takes into account the environmental needs of the people who live in this central area, while still meeting the affordable homes requirement.

What controls will there be over developers who will try to ride roughshod over the general guidelines for the public green space? Will the proposed area be clearly delineated before sale and passed over to the Parish Council to own/ manage without a further lease?

The Eric Lock Road West – Lyth Hill Road pedestrian corridor is now a statutory right because it has been enjoyed as a footpath without restriction for over 20 years. It should be included on the plan as a right of way. Spurs should be added to give access to the open area. If this can be done for the community hub area, then why not elsewhere?

The emphasis placed on tree preservation is good. Now is the time for individual TPOs to be placed on all categories A and B trees as recommended in the report. General guidelines are not enough because developers will find it easy to conveniently overlook them.

The Yew tree Drive field is merely a tactical ploy by the church to deflect attention away from Glebe field. Certainly, the flooding problem which affects some houses in that area should be addressed. But that is no justification for the decimation of the open space on the Glebe field. We do not need doubling up of the excellent Community woodland area at the other end of the village, in another fringe location.

We need preservation and enhancement of what we already have in this central part of the village, not elsewhere, and on a more generous scale than the meagre 25% outlined in these plans. Overall, I feel that the proposals require much greater awareness and refinement.

84. With reference to the Oakland and Glebe field Development Concept, I would like to lodge my strong opposition to the development of the proposed for the Glebefield. I will be very much affected by any changes. I would like to know where the entry road will be into any new development. Opposite my home? I chose this house for the quiet cul-de-sac that it was in, with a lovely open area to the front. Does this really need to change?

Having looked at the tree survey that has been carried out it strikes me that any homes near to the veteran trees would have a considerable shade problem and to fell these trees would be outrageous. The wild life that they sustain must be considerable. The proposed green area is so small that it cannot seriously be considered to be sufficient? My own children played in the Glebefield, and now my grandchildren plays 'debs' there too – the area shown to remain green is simply not enough for these youngsters to run about. In these days of obese children sitting indoors, what price can be put on a bit of good old fresh air and exercise? I cross the Glebefield daily and have rarely seen it with nobody there – it is a well-used and important piece of green land for the community.

I welcome the plans for a new library and play area – both are necessary. What I object to is the last bit of open land on this side of the village being swallowed up by housing.

85. North East boundary – Please take in to consideration any housing near this boundary needs to be no more than one story high in order to maintain privacy of adjoining bungalows
86. The area if it has to be built should have low density mixed housing for young and old requirements with open areas for walking and a modern play space unlike the old out of date Longmeadow space and the housing should have solar panels. The library should be included in this space as well with short stay parking spaces and a communal room.
87. I have been a resident of Bayston Hill for the past 44 years and have seen many changes to the village in that time. My family and I have been involved in many activities on the Glebe lands throughout the years including, Village fetes, football matches, and scout and guide activities including bonfire night which always produced excellent support from the villagers.

88. On learning of the proposed development of this site and having attended Proposals for the development of the site by the various stakeholders over the past twelve months I feel the need to comment on the Concept Plan and Planning Brief.

The need for an Open space for community activities or just walking the dog in this area is overwhelming. The Open space (shown in green on the concept plan) also includes existing grounds to York House, excluding that the remaining area is only about 25% of the total area available of the site. This is insufficient for the needs of the current residents and any additional residents from the proposed development.

I feel that the proposed Open space for behind York house will be perceived by both existing and new residents as part of the new development and therefore not for general use/activities. I feel to redress this perceived imbalance, it would be better if the new housing be immediately behind York House and the open space South of that bordering on the rear of Lyth Hill Road houses and in line with the existing Glebe land's boundary. In addition, the proposed footpaths could follow this boundary and link into the existing pedestrian access into Lyth Hill Road.

I agree with the Planning Brief that creating another access from Eric Lock Road West although feasible should not be supported as it would be a link road to Glebe road with an increase in traffic.

I am concerned that any development of this site would inevitably cause an increase in vehicles, which would further worsen an already intolerable situation of access/egress from/to Bayston Hill from the A49, especially at peak times. As a major development is currently in progress at Pulley Lane, Bayston Hill, the proposed development should be kept to a minimum as the proposed increase in dwellings of 50/60 by 2026 should surely be met in the main by the aforementioned development.

89. Firstly - I would like to offer my deep reservations and regret about the potential loss of the Glebefield for community use – this land has been used by villagers for many years as a community recreation area and open space.

If this space is lost the nearest available public open space will be at the other end of the village, namely the Stanley Park Fields/Sensory Gardens area. How are the elderly, disabled and parents with toddlers and young children who live locally expected to be able access these facilities at the other end of the village if they don't have any transport?

I also note according to the plan that there is some open space to be retained surrounding Christchurch and York House – this amount of open space is inadequate for public use and why is it proposed to be situated in the vicinity of York House and Christchurch?

Surely Christchurch and York House already have enough open space surrounding their property, why do they need more. There is also a suggestion to enhance the planted boundary around York House, it is not needed there. If open space is retained there, how is it to be accessed by the public, where are the footpaths to be located?

The ancient hedge to the rear of the houses on Lyth Hill Road along the south east border of the Glebefield and the scrubland to the rear of houses on Eric Lock Road West are valuable wildlife areas and should be retained and protected, any available open space should be added to these areas as they are valuable natural wildlife habitats.

Another concern I have is that there is a path that runs from the Scout and Guide HQ on Eric Lock Road West along the south east border of the Glebe field and connects up with Lyth Hill Road, this path has been used by villagers for over 40 years and probably long. As this path has been used for over 20 years without any obstruction it is my understanding that it is now a public right of way. What provision is to be made for retaining this path, if any? Best regards

90. The concept plan as published shows much of housing land in places of highest ecological value. Having carefully read this report, we feel that this should be changed so that the open green space should be located principally along the south eastern mature woodland boundary and the north eastern hedge-line; housing then can be placed more towards the middle of the development area which is of lowest ecological value.

This will most readily acknowledge the report's main conclusions and allow its recommendations to be achieved. Namely: (page 13) the mature hedge-line and trees continue to provide both good habitat for bats (a legally protected species) and connectivity is maintained between the north east of the site and the mature oak woodland border to the south east where bat activity is most concentrated (page 17). (Pages 18 &19) that the ecological impact of development should be low with tree and hedge lines retained and incorporated into the development, and a sensitive lighting plan followed.

91. My main concern after reading the Planning brief is pedestrian access to the proposed open space. Although it states that there should be a network of footpaths, there is no indication of where these should be. The site needs to be easily and safely accessible for all residents of the village as the Glebe field is at present, particularly any play area or sheltered garden for older people. I also believe it is important to retain the current, very well used, footpath linking Lyth Hill Road with the rest of the village across the Southern edge of the site to the Scout HQ on Eric Lock Road West and also with the old Oakland school on the Northern edge. Having lived in the village for over 30 years I know how important these links are and preferably they should be also retained in the form of wild life corridors.

Another concern is in the housing types, although I have been assured it has been considered, there is no mention of housing 'to buy' for older people wishing to downsize as asked for by many people in the original consultations.

My final concern is about retaining the scrub areas. I have read the ecological appraisal and although it says trees should be retained where possible it does not include retaining the scrub areas. I have had bats roosting in my eaves for many years now, but unfortunately for some reason they are not here this year. If the scrub and blackthorn areas go it is unlikely they will return. Having brought up my family with the enjoyment of having the Glebe field as an open access green space I can only hope these concerns will be considered when the final brief is drawn up.

92. We would wish to make the following comments on the above Bayston Hill Oakland and Glebe land Concept Plan.

- It is difficult to make constructive comments as the drawings and documents are not precise about what is planned. For example what area is being allocated for housing, what is planned to be public open space and where will access roads enter the site? Also what increase in population is envisaged?
- In essence we are opposed to any development on the Glebe lands site but realise that this is privately owned. It is currently leased to Bayston Hill Parish Council for public recreational use and we would hope that the full extent of this lease would be honoured.

Our children used to play on the Glebe lands regularly over many years as this area is close to where we live (Lyth Hill Road), and safe for children to access unsupervised whereas the other recreational areas are too far from us to be easily reached by young children independently. We would feel that the loss of the Glebe lands would be very detrimental to the residents and particularly youngsters from this end of the village.

- We understand that there is an offer by the Diocese to make available some land off Yew Tree Drive instead. We do not understand whether this is to be donated to the Village, sold or rented. Whichever, the Diocese should be required to alleviate existing drainage problems which we understand exist rather than passing the expense of these works to public authorities/council taxpayers. In any case we feel this site is nowhere near as accessible to us as the Glebe land is.
- We acknowledge that the Oakland School site should be used for Community facilities and housing. We welcome the proposals for a new improved library, Parish Council office and community facilities. We would not object to the old library site being used for housing. We feel it is important that new independent community facilities on the Oakland School site should be distinct from Christ Church. We feel that too close a linkage to the Church could deter some residents from utilising the facilities.
- We would hope that if housing on the Glebelands site was forced upon us, this would be affordable housing (affordable to local first time buyers that is) and accommodation for the elderly as we would hope would be the case for any housing on the Oakland School site.
- The documentation suggests that 50-60 more houses need to be provided in Bayston Hill by 2026. Surely this target must now be close to achievement as Shropshire Council has already approved a large development in Pulley Lane as well as several smaller developments on the edge of the village, some in the Green Belt which residents and the Parish Council were strongly opposed to. As a result we do not need significant further housing in Bayston Hill.
- Can we be reassured that the existing sewage system is sufficient to deal with any housing provided on the Oakland/Glebeland site (although we note that it is unclear what the number of houses planned is)? Are you sure that the local GP surgery can cope with the "proposed" increase in population? Similarly can the school cope with additional numbers?
- A large development on this site would increase traffic in the village further. Traffic on Lyth Hill Road has increased dramatically over the last few years and puts pressure on the junction with the A49. A mini roundabout at this junction would help to alleviate this a little.
- The current footpath from Lyth Hill Road to Glebe Road and also to Eric Lock Road West needs to be retained. We understand that these are not a public right of way but have been used continuously as such for over 60 years which surely must give the public some rights.
- We are concerned about the future of the Scout/Guide hut. This is a little vague in the Planning Brief.
- We trust that any development which is ultimately agreed would be environmentally sound and would seek to limit the loss of as few trees as possible.
- To sum up, we are opposed to the loss of any further public recreational areas but realise that the Glebeland is privately owned. We do not wish to see large housing developments in/around Bayston Hill. We do not wish to see the Glebe land space replaced with a substandard site off Yew Tree Drive which is not easily accessed. We welcome enhanced independent community facilities on the Oakland School site but consider that these should

be distinct from Christ Church. We accept that some appropriate housing could be provided on the Oakland School site.

We trust that Shropshire Council will give this proposed project very careful scrutiny and will take full account of residents' views.

93. I would like to be informed please of the plans for; Water supply route, Storm water route, Sewer route. It is widely believed in the village of Bayston Hill that the infrastructure concerning water and it's disposal currently operates at its limit. Your comments and a drawing/plan of the proposal relating to this would be useful and I would appreciate it if such could be forwarded to me.

94. There does seem to be a reasonable sized open space left. Need to ensure that access is for all residents and not just the new development. It's good to see children's play area- too far to get to the other one with small toddlers. Hope this is a "must" for any developer.

Housing choice. Mention in plan details of small units to rent for elderly. This is not what is required. Too many of us are in large family homes, having come here in our 20s, and are now wishing to downsize but remain in the village. Could McCartney and Stone or a similar retirement property developer be interested in at least part of the site? Many elderly still wish to own their property for financial security.

What density of housing? Area surrounding the site is not at high density and should be taken into account when drawing up plans to avoid the horror of the "homes" on The Foxes site. No gardens, no privacy etc.

TPO's are now on many of the ancient oaks. That hedge line is at least Anglo Saxon in age- local historian (Ernie Jenks) traced it back several years ago. Hope that there is legislation to ensure that they are not removed "in error" by the developer as has happened in the past.

95. I have looked at the plans for the site. Over all they look reasonable. I did notice they said about building a range of houses but did not include self-build plots. I believe that we would be missing out if we did not include these in the development. They are in line with the council's plans, innovative, becoming more in demand. They are better built and designed than the mass produced home builders houses, those that build them stay and tend to be more proactive in the communities. I would highly recommend these be included.

96. My family have lived in Bayston Hill for over 50 years and I worked for thirty of those years at Oakland Primary School on Glebe Road. As you might imagine I am extremely concerned as to the state of the school at the present time and the view that it gives of Bayston Hill. I was astonished to read in the Villager that a further consultation has been postponed until September - a further period of time whilst the weeds etc. grow around the school and the school building deteriorates. I appreciate decisions of this nature do take time but this is now years!! For the sake of the looks of Bayston Hill and, especially those who live opposite the school building, could not, at least, the grounds be kept tidy and not the eyesore that they are at present. Anyone wishing to move into the village, I am sure, would be totally "put off" when they see the state of the school area. Customer has written in to us again saying she has had no response so far, please can customer be contacted regarding this query.

97. Our overriding comment – this is a deeply flawed concept. It runs counter to the wishes of the local community as expressed repeatedly since this joint project was first mooted. At the drop-in event at

the Methodist Church Hall on Saturday 16th November 2013 some 63% of respondents said they would like the Glebelands site to be kept as open space.

The development plan should therefore de-couple the Oakland and Glebefield elements. There is a clear record of local consultation and consensus at least since October 2012 (and less formally before this too), which culminated in the reports of the Oakland Site Working Group which should now be progressed in its own right. The housing development envisaged following the intervention of the diocese and its plan to sell the Glebefield is unacceptably large and at too high a cost in terms of lost community green-space (the Glebefield).

Commentary on the documents:

Planning Brief - Page 1, Opportunities arising from the development of the site: Community Facilities - This claims to give the opportunity to improve these, but fails to acknowledge that the loss of the Glebefield as it is now would result in facilities inferior to those currently available. It also cites changes to the church layout & car-park provision which are questionable 'community facilities'. Regardless, surely these changes are not only dependent on this joint development project? Open Space referred to in the concept plan does NOT compensate for some of the loss of the current open space, because the main virtue of the Glebefield is its existing size and completeness.

Page 2, Reference to possible access to land off Yew Tree Drive is conjectural and thus unhelpful.

Housing - To what extent can the wish-list be insisted upon? Affordable housing and accommodation for rent are important requirements. The retention of trees and hedgerows is essential rather than 'required wherever possible'.

Page 4 - CS4 Community Hubs and Community Clusters. Bayston Hill is not the sort rural community that requires the sort of 'rebalancing' referred to. The case has not been proven for additional housing need on the scale envisaged by this large (i.e. joint) development. What and where is the evidence to support this?

Page 5 CS17 Environmental Networks Policy has to 'protect the quality of the natural and built environment'. The Concept Development Plan categorically cannot improve on the existing natural environment. It will degrade it.

Page 6 Policy S16.2 (ii) Bayston Hill & Shropshire LDF SPDs If the Parish Council still has affordable housing as a priority requirement, it should insist that this development should provide such housing at a rate of at least 15% and preferably more.

Page 7 – Access, Parking and Highways All the stipulations here are sensible, welcome and important. It's vital that they are carried forward in the detail of any development of this site. E.g. A single point of access; no through vehicle route; pedestrian links as outlined.

However, any additional housing will increase the volume of traffic both within the village and into and out of it. The concept plan does not provide any case for this being sustainable.

Page 8 Trees. See also BS 5837 Tree Survey and Report. Both documents emphasise the uniqueness and value of a significant numbers of trees within both sites and more particularly on the boundaries. To be consistent, and to safeguard all those with Category A & B status, TPOs should be imposed on them all. This should be done now, rather than later, as some sections of the texts suggest. The development plan should in no way jeopardise the current and future life of the trees; they are a significant asset to the village and contribute to its biodiversity. Para 3.1 requires the

details of the Tree Survey to be shown on the layout plan. This has yet to be done and the map made publicly available. Trees and Development Constraints (Section 3 of Tree Report) Paras 3.5 – 3.10 refer to the likely existence of extensive tree root networks and issues relating to shading. It would make much more sense therefore to locate the open green space shown in the concept plan along the southern boundary.

Para 2.8 highlights the lack of clarity about the precise location of the boundary on the southern side. In addition, there is a footpath (of very longstanding) and fence at the rear of the Oakland site. The requirement that it is therefore 'necessary to identify the exact boundary before any development proposals are submitted or the site is sold' should not be overlooked.

There is no indication of how this will be determined, and how the result will be publicised. These are two equally important issues.

Ecology - At the time of writing, the report of the Extended Phase 1 Survey which has been undertaken was not available. Since this report forms part of the Planning Brief, its recommendations must be adhered to. This is particularly relevant to ecological issues relating to the southern boundary which predates the Glebefield / Oakland estate and is clearly visible on 1882 mapping. This area also falls within a 'corridor' area of Shropshire Council's Environmental Network.

Opportunities for continued consultation - The Oakland project has provided a model of good practice for local democracy. This period of consultation is appreciated too. It is to be hoped that that this practice will continue and all local residents and other stakeholders will be kept involved and their views regarded.

98. Open Space – We were informed at Christ Church open evening that the proposed open space in the concept plan is more than the minimum required for this type of development – limiting the housing development to 50/60 houses which we were pleased to hear. However, the DB does not specify the acreage of the open space that has been shown in the concept plan to achieve this limitation on the number of houses that could be built. We would like this acreage stated to protect the land from further development to be now and in the future

Housing – We would like the proposed buildings/housing on the development to be set back a minimum of 21m from the current boundary of the houses on Eric Lock Road West

Housing – The concept plan shows a green boundary, 5m deep along the western edge of the development, adjacent to Eric Lock Rd West, however, the DB makes no mention of any requirement to maintain trees and hedgerows along this boundary of a minimum depth of 16m, the current depth is maintained along the western edge adjacent to the properties along Eric Lock Road West

Access, parking and highways considerations – We were also informed at Christ Church DB Open evening that there would be no vehicle access from the new development onto Eric Lock Road West. The DB states that a through road – from the Glebe Road access to the development – would not be supported, however, the DB then goes on to state that an access allowing vehicle access on to Eric Lock Road West would be considered. We would request that the DB explicitly does not allow any vehicle access onto Eric Lock Road West, now or in the future.

99. Shropshire Council has taken full advantage of new Government guidelines for planning and have already violated the longstanding agreement on the new Parish boundary, i.e. 33 houses just North of Meole Brace and others in the pipeline.

Footpaths in the fields between Meole Brace and Bayston Hill have been re-routed, presumably to facilitate further development



A Number of houses have been 'infilled' in the village and consideration is also being given to development of the Old School garden. If such development continues there will be a demand for an additional School. We already have one on this site, in an accessible part of the village and it seems foolish to me that such an area should be wasted on housing. There is room for both School and Parish facilities on the Oakland site.

When further development expands Bayston Hill, a green space near the centre to provide a 'lung' for the village and to provide informal exercise area is not just desirable, but essential. We hear more and more about young people of both sexes spending hours in front of a computer and we should not give them an excuse for lack of exercise by depriving the village of such a suitable area. The current playing field is an excellent additional to the village, but not a necessarily requires control of its use.

Concerning the brief, No dimensions of building area/garden area are given. A portion of the Church land is given over to parking while a portion of the existing Church Car Park seems to be allocated for housing. When this Church was built, the land was given by the Diocese for the purpose of making an open, attractive, visage which would also provide space for Church and village activities, for Church expansion and for the Playgroup which occupied the Church for many years before it was moved to Longmeadow. Who is to say that it would not return to the Church under another vicar?

Money for the Church was given mainly by the people of this village, the diocesan finances at that time preventing them from making more than a token contribution. Taking this land to allow house building when the County is already granting permission for development outside the boundary seems to me to be very short-sighted and insulting to the people of this village who gave so much to enable it. Once lost, it will never be regained.

The planning brief mentions a new scout & Guide HQ but no reference to this is made on the drawings? Reference is made to other Glebeland behind Yewtree Drive, but I fail to see the relevance of this. As far as I know there is no vehicular access from the village, only pedestrian access from Yewtree Drive with possible vehicular access from Lyth Hill Road across someone else's land.

Some years ago, the county planners issued a document showing possible areas of development around Bayston Hill. Since then we have had a number of applications for bits and pieces of development, no sign of an overall plan for the area to cover, say, the next ten years. I would have thought that our planners could produce such a plan, in spite of staffing cuts, so that we could comment on the whole, rather than be fed information in dribs and drabs like a child being spoon fed. An example of this failiure to plan properly in the past is that although there are between 5 and 6 thousand people now in the village, this only community centre we have is the memorial hall, built by the village in the 1920's, population about 200, to honour their dead in the 1<sup>st</sup> World War.

100. The first comment I have to make is that I am totally against developing the Glebeland. Not a case of Nimbyism but on the grounds of not losing a green space in the centre of the village. Recent research (Exeter University) has shown that living near a green space can prevent depression for five years after moving away. London has not built on its parks.

Page 1, para 2, Will the café be in the hub or the Church? It needs to be in the hub for maximum village use, as at the Lantern. The footpath from Eric Lock Road West to Lyth Hill is used frequently and must be maintained. It has been in constant use for 40 years at least. The trees on the border of the gardens on Lyth Hill Road must be retained, they are beautiful.

Page 2 Para1, Are the plans to develop Yew tree Drive a definite or just a maybe? We need definite information.

Page 2 Housing. There is no mention at all of any numbers of houses to be built if the whole site is developed, we need this information.

Page 2 Para2, Re public rights of way. This has been used as such for at least 40 years. Whilst access to the field has been closed on Christmas day from the Church entrance, it has never been closed from Eric Lock Road West or Lyth Hill Rd.

Page 3 section 4. This whole section may be understandable to a planner but not a generally intelligent member of the public! Clarification needed. I presume it means you have to obey planning laws in force at the time which could mean anything.

Page 5 last para. Why were they not 'saved?' More weasel words.

Page 6. Policy 16.2 if the development goes ahead and affordable housing is built, could it please be safeguarded for Bayston Hill residents use and not for an opportunity for buy to let Landlords. I am sure you have the ability to do this.

Page 7 Access. Good to retain pedestrian routes, let us hope it happens.

There must be two parking spaces per house. People have to work, get their children to School and nursery and more importantly pick them up again, greens may prefer buses and bikes but it is not always practical. We do not want more car littering because not enough spaces provided.

Page 8 Tree. I presume the developers will have to obey the law on preserving trees and trust out Council Officers will ensure those trees needing preservation orders will get them.

Page 9, ROW. The term 'Dog walkers' is often used in a sneering tone, however, whenever I walked through the field this Summer, as well as dog walkers I observed small families playing ball games, Scouts and Guides and groups of young people just chilling, oh yes and dog walkers keeping themselves healthy as well as walking their dogs.

The paragraph relating to needs of local residents is apt. Although your plan looks generous with its big green splodge, it is obvious that at least half of that splodge will be non accessible as it is private to York House and the Church.

**End of Comments**