



To Planning Inspectorate: submitted online 15/06/2023 to- Appeals Casework Portal [Reference: APP/H1840/W/23/3320041 \(planninginspectorate.gov.uk\)](https://www.planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

PLANNING INSPECTORATE REF: - APP/H1840/W/23/3320041
Mactaggart and Mickel Homes England Ltd. and John Alison Land and Research Ltd.

Outline application for up to 100 No. dwellings, to include green infrastructure, car parking, drainage works, and other associated infrastructure works (all matters reserved except access). Land at (Os 9075 5799) Evelench Lane Tibberton

Planning Application Number W/22/01565/OUT

Contents Index:

Page	Paragraphs	Subject
1	01	Introduction
2	02 - 04	Disproportionate impact on character of village - overdevelopment
2 - 4	05 - 11	Unsuitability of location – unsustainability
4	12	Lack of services
4 - 5	13 - 14	No benefit of proposed new amenities to village
5	15 – 16	Loss of current amenities and public rights of way
5 - 6	17 - 22	Ecology and Environment Issues
6 - 8	23 – 27	Grade II Listed Bridge
8 - 12	28 - 39	Highways, traffic and congestion
12 - 15	40 - 42	Village Infrastructure Problems
15 - 16	43 - 46	Poor standard of engagement and material
17	47 - 49	Summary
18 - 28	Appendix 1	A. Summary Speed Watch statistics 2018 – 2022 (full years) B. Details Speed Watch statistics 2018 – 2023 (May)

Representation from Tibberton Parish Council

01 Tibberton Parish Council restates its strong objection to this application for 100 houses on this site – commonly referred to as Plough Meadow. The appellant’s central argument for approval of this application is that Wychavon District Council cannot currently demonstrate an available five-year land supply. However, our strong contention is that despite multiple documents in their application and appeal the appellant has completely failed to demonstrate evidence of justification for this housing development in this specific location. It has failed to address widespread concerns previously detailed in the numerous responses from villagers, statutory consultees, and other parties to Wychavon’s original consultation on the application which ended on 30th September 2022, and many of its claims in its original application, subsequent responses and appeal documentation are disingenuous and unconvincing.

Disproportionate impact on character of village - overdevelopment

02 Tibberton is not against sensible and appropriate housing growth. The village has supported a number of housing developments over the last 20 years and already met all its new housing obligations under the current South Worcestershire Development Plan (intended to run to 2030). Indeed, it has exceeded these when including a number of in-fill developments. Crucially all of these previous housing developments have been sympathetic to the character and size of the village, retaining existing boundaries or making only slight alterations.

03 This is in complete contrast to this application for 100 homes on the Plough Meadow site which is completely disproportionate and unsympathetic to our village character and takes no account of the major detrimental impact on the community. It increases the size of the village by over 33%, significantly changes current village boundaries, conflicts with the absence of suitable local services, creates intolerable infrastructure problems and would fundamentally destroy the character of the village forever – removing invaluable green and ecologically important space and effectively creating a massive housing estate in the centre of the village. It is a perfect example of over-development and unsustainability.

04 Furthermore, building on Plough Meadow site opens up the potential for further major development of other adjacent green space. At its public consultation event, the appellant openly acknowledged their intention to develop plans for further large-scale housing on these adjacent sites. This application is a tipping point. Once this site is built on, it will inevitably lead to further applications for high density house building on adjacent sites destroying Tibberton as a village in all but name.

Unsuitability of location – unsustainability

05 The Statement of Case for Hearing document (paragraph 5.8) states, *“There is no dispute that Tibberton is a suitable location for housing development beyond current settlement boundaries”*. And (5.9) *“Specifically, the Appellant considers the site to be a suitable location as demonstrated by the identification of part of the site as an allocation in the emerging SWDP review”* This is not true. Wychavon District Council has previously rejected

this site as unsuitable for housing development on at least two previous occasions. It is not included as a site in the current SWDP and whilst it is a provisional site for a much smaller number of houses (26) in the SWDP review, consultation on the review is ongoing. As stated in Wychavon's pre-application report of 10th February 2022 it is possible that on completion of the consultation this site could be scaled back further or removed altogether.

- 06 The Statement of Case for Hearing document also acknowledges that the accompanying draft statement of common ground "*...has **not** been subject to detailed discussions with the (Wychavon) Council*" (paragraph 1.5). In other words, they are not statements of common ground at all.
- 07 In paragraph 4.8 of its Statement of Case for Hearing document the appellant highlights examples of six appeals decisions to permit house building in open countryside, contrary to SWDP2, as justification for approval of this application. However, in four of these examples it was for a single house which is not remotely comparable to this case.
- 08 The appellant states that "*No formal objections have been raised by consultees*" (paragraph 5.3). This is misleading. Worcestershire Wildlife Trust object to the application on grounds of adverse impacts on wildlife, habitat, and ecology. The Canal & Rivers Trust raised a number of concerns about the impact on the Grade II listed single-track bridge which is the single entrance to Tibberton from the north and, if not satisfied, have reserved the right to submit a further response objecting to the application. Worcestershire County Council Highways department have identified a number of outstanding highways and transport matters and continue to recommend that the application be deferred. The response from Herefordshire & Worcestershire Primary Care highlighted the significant challenging impact of 100 new houses in this location on the delivery of local primary care provision and service demand.
- 09 Worcester Children's Services emphasised there are insufficient places at Tibberton First School or related first schools, nor at catchment middle and high schools due to the impact of other housing developments in Droitwich. It is clear the appellant has failed to address this. The pupil estimate numbers used for this conclusion are conservative given that 100 houses are most likely to attract new families as evidenced by the appellant's letter to Councillor Powell of 11th April (appendix 7.1 of the Planning Statement document) which promises that the proposed 100 houses "*could be delivering homes for young families by 2025*". It is reasonable to assume each house will have one, two or more children needing access to schools, so the true shortfall of school places is likely to be much higher than projected. The appellant has suggested that a short term resolution to the lack of capacity at Tibberton CofE First School is that parents could travel to alternative schools and in paragraph 3.6 of the Supplementary Transport statement lists a number of schools within the same catchment as the First School but this is an error as they are not in the same catchment (they are just other first and primary schools in the Droitwich areas). We know due to significant expansion of housing in and around Droitwich that many of these already have limited available spaces. So, this is not a practical solution at all.

- 10 Furthermore, the appellant has failed to address the wide range of objections raised by the Parish Council and over 120 other Tibberton residents. In their Statement of Case document (5.17) the appellant dismisses the Parish Council’s legitimate concerns about the housing percentage increase as “too simplistic”, but this issue is fundamental to our concerns about over-development and unsustainability and ignores the many other reasons the Parish Council and others have highlighted as objections.
- 11 The appellant proceeds to quote the Council’s Landscape Officer’s comments from 22nd October 2022 to support its case – but the quote is selective and ignores the Officer’s other concerns about the loss of pastoral land, and the impact on the enjoyment of public rights of way. The Landscape Officer concludes by stating that *“If, however, development of the extent proposed cannot be justified in the planning balance in terms of housing need, then I suggest that the proposal is not supported in order that the Primary Key Characteristic for the LT of ‘Pastoral land use’ is conserved and the Landscape Guideline to ‘maintain overall pastoral land use’ is followed as required by Policy SWDP25*

Lack of Services

- 12 The appellant states the site is *“well connected to key services and public transport in the village”* (5.25) but this is totally disingenuous. Tibberton has barely any services to justify this development location. It has very limited public transport. There are no bus services to Droitwich – which is the nearest town centre and only two services (number 356) to Worcester on Monday to Saturday (none on Sundays or bank holidays). Residents need to travel by car or taxi to reach supermarkets, GP practices, dental surgeries, veterinary surgeries, pharmacies, and leisure facilities. Even well-known takeaway companies don’t deliver to the village. Tibberton has no shop or post office and whilst the site is close to two pubs it is at the opposite end of the village from the church and nowhere near the new village hall. This development in this location is entirely unsustainable.

No benefit of proposed new amenities to village.

- 13 The appellant states the village will benefit from new allotments – but the village already has allotments which are underutilised so there is no evidence of additional need. The appellant claims a community car park will benefit parents dropping off children at Tibberton CofE First School and visitors seeking to use the public rights of way, but this is misleading.
- This car park would be on the same location as the existing Speed the Plough pub car park which is already used for these purposes – so there’s no new benefit to the village. It is ridiculous to suggest that visitors would journey to Tibberton to park their cars just to walk along a public footpath across a housing estate and, as at present, because this car park is some distance from the school and has no safe route, most parents are likely to continue to choose to park on the road nearer to the school to drop off and collect their children.
- 14 We note the appellant has not yet identified a practical safe route from the public car park to the school. In the supplementary transport document (2.2.3), the appellant seeks to assuage the highways authority’s concerns on this matter by suggesting a pedestrian

crossing at the Evelench Lane/Plough Road junction. Evelench Lane is a narrow access road for houses, apartments, and a farm along the lane with a tight turning onto the busy Plough Road. At peak times or when vehicles are trying to negotiate parked cars on Plough Road – it can take 10 to 15 minutes for vehicles to exit Evelench Lane. It has a tight semi blind turning onto Plough Road so a pedestrian crossing at this location is impractical and likely to cause significant further hazards and bottlenecks.

Loss of current amenities and public rights of way

- 15 We also note the comments from the Landscape Officer in her email of 24th October 2022, *“Development as proposed would also impact on the enjoyment of the use of the public rights of way across the site, and views from those footpaths – as the context would change from footpaths in a rural setting with views out to the surrounding rural landscape to footpaths set within ‘suburban’ development”*. The appellant infers the development could positively benefit cycle ways and canal towpaths with no real evidence to support this assertion. Tibberton is already popular and accessible for cyclists and is on the main cycleway, whilst residents and visitors have already seen improvements to the canal towpath – particularly to Worcester.
- 16 Conversely, Tibberton and the health and wellbeing of residents would suffer from this development through the removal of important and treasured green space in the heart of the village which residents, visitors and walkers regularly enjoy. Plough Meadow forms a natural green corridor from the Birmingham and Worcester canal through to the village which is a key aspect of its character and appeal to residents and visitors. This would be lost forever and instead replaced by a series of urban footpaths across a housing estate.

Ecology and Environment Issues

- 17 Although the site is prone to frequent flooding and drainage issues this means that it also provides a valuable ecological habitat which Wychavon District Council has identified as including “features of ecological interest”. This space is important for biodiversity and geodiversity and is a haven for fauna, small wildlife including foxes, rabbits, small mammals and bats and a rich variety of birds, bees, butterflies, and other insects. The submission from Worcestershire Wildlife Trust confirms that nesting curlews have been spotted and heard.
- 18 Approval of the plans to develop Plough Meadow, in whole or even in part, would further contribute to the catastrophic loss of numbers of Curlew in lowland Britain and to the national and global decline of this red-list species. The UK population of curlew is globally important and was added to the UK red list in December 2015, and it is argued to be the most pressing bird conservation priority in the UK.
- 19 The Ecological Appraisal that accompanies the Planning Application records ‘non-breeding’ as the curlew’s ‘likely on-site status’ (Pilot Breeding Bird Survey, Table EDP A4.2). The Appraisal acknowledges that curlew have been recorded ‘in the large field east of the railway’ but states that there is ‘no suitable habitat within the site’. In the ecology

appendix to the Statement of Case for Hearing this assertion is repeated following select site visits from EDP.

20 However, this evaluation appears to neglect the fact that breeding curlews require both a foraging territory and a nesting site. The nesting site will typically be on drier, flatter ground among long grass, while the foraging territory will typically be on rough, damper pasture with tussocks. Many Tibberton residents have heard and seen curlew both in the air and on the ground in Plough Meadow during the breeding season, suggesting that from their perspective Plough Meadow is part of their foraging territory.

21 A villager whose house overlooks Plough Meadow maintains a natural history log and has records for curlew in Plough Meadow on numerous dates in the breeding period in the past four years:

- 2022: 16 March, 18 March, 1 May
 - 2021: 24 March, 31 March, 2 April, 3 April, 19 April, 22 April, 14 May, 16 May, 27 May
- Two of these records (19 and 22 April 2021) are from dates in same the week that the on-site Pilot Breeding Bird Survey was conducted for the Ecological Appraisal.
- 2020: 5 March, 22 March, 23 March, 24 March, 25 March, 26 March, 27 March, 31 March, 5 April, 7 April, 10 April, 11 April, 12 April, 14 April, 15 April, 16 April, 19 April, 6 May, 7 May, 8 May, 28 May, 29 May, 30 May, 31 May, 3 June, 8 June, 9 June, 12 June, 14 June, 15 June, 17 June
 - 2019: 16 June, 8 July (alarm call indicating presence of young)

We respectfully suggest that the detailed nature observations from a villager who lives adjacent to Plough Meadow coupled with the expert knowledge and observations of Worcestershire Wildlife Trust is sufficient evidence to refute the appellant's claims.

22 Another existing precious benefit for the village and its residents is its "dark skies" and the absence of street lighting. At the public exhibition the appellant assured villagers they had no intention of including street lighting in this development, but we note with grave concern the comment in paragraph 5.5 of the appendix 4 Transport Statement that the question of the introduction of street lighting would also be addressed through the Section 278 agreement. Street lighting would increase light pollution and completely ruin the character of the village and be to the great detriment of our rural life that villagers consider so special.

Grade II Listed Bridge

23 There are only two routes in and out of the village both via Plough Road. Access to this site is via a road replacing the Speed the Plough pub car park which is towards the north entrance to the village from Droitwich. Entrance/exit is via a narrow, one vehicle width, Grade II listed Bridge which has a partially blind 90-degree turn. Throughout the process the developers have ignored or dismissed the problems this would create highlighted in comments from villagers, the Canals & Rivers Trust, and Worcestershire Highways.

- 24 The bridge is already heavily used. Droitwich is the nearest town and used by many villagers for shopping access to GP, pharmacy, library, leisure facilities, railway station, employment, and schools. People travelling to and from Droitwich travel over the bridge. Residents know from daily experience that there has been increased in traffic through the village with drivers using this route as an alternative to the busy A38 and because of the impact of Worcester 6 business site and housing developments on the fringe of Droitwich on Tagwell Road and Newland Lane – so that drivers use Plough Road as an alternative “rat run”.
- 25 The bridge was never designed for such high traffic flow or large vehicles. Consequently, there are already frequent holdups and near misses on this bridge. There have been several major incidents causing structural damage to the bridge including August 2015 – which resulted in the bridge being closed for several days - and March 2020, when a lorry became stuck on the bridge (see photos below). Neither of these incidents are mentioned in the appellant’s Transport Assessment document safety record section (section 2.6, page 7).



- 26 There has also been significant degradation to the bridge structure due to increased traffic usage (as seen on the image, below) and an initially temporary maximum 3 tonnes weight restriction is being introduced to enable bridge repairs.



- 27 Placing a huge housing development on Plough Meadow would inevitably increase the traffic navigating this bridge to an intolerable level, resulting in significant congestion and a high risk of accidents and further structural damage to the listed bridge. In its supplementary transport note (3.2.9) the appellant has made a ridiculous assertion based on “google maps” that 50% of residents living on this new site may choose to journey south down Plough Road to travel to Droitwich, even though this is the wrong direction, an indirect and awkward route and would typically add over 15 minutes travel time (not the “slightly longer” claimed in the document)!

Highways, traffic and congestion

- 28 We note that the Highways Authority have significant ongoing concerns about the site including access. We also have major concerns about access issues. The draft master plan for the development is for a single access/exit road development, i.e., a cul-de-sac layout. We are advised that cul-de-sac layouts should only have a road length of 160 metres, whereas this will be considerably longer. It does not have a secondary means of access and egress for emergency vehicles. Coupled with the sheer scale of a development of 100 houses with the likelihood of up to 200 cars, delivery vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians all negotiating a single access and exit point and spilling onto an already busy narrow village road, this is bound to cause significant problems and hazards.
- 29 We continue to dispute the claimed impact on traffic density from this development which is predominantly based on desk-based research and dubious data in contrast to the real experience of daily life for Tibberton residents.

- 30 The appellant suggests the affect of the development would be an extra 17 vehicles northbound over the bridge per hour and 6 vehicles southbound per hour in morning peak hour – or 1 every 3.5 minutes northbound and 1 every 10 minutes southbound. This is patently absurd. The development will comprise 100 houses primarily aimed at families so it is reasonable to assume there will be 2 cars per household or 200 cars. Why would this produce only 23 car journeys at peak times? There is no bus service northbound and a very limited bus service southbound. Anyone travelling to work (other than Worcester) will need to drive whilst nearest shops, GP surgeries, pharmacies, and leisure facilities are several miles away. Worcestershire Children’s Service have confirmed there will not be sufficient spaces at the village school and so parents will have to drive children to alternative schools. It is obvious that the actual number of additional car journeys will be significantly higher.
- 31 The data used from TRICS national database to calculate these figures is highly questionable. None of the selected regions from the TRICS database are in Worcestershire, and all seem very different communities from Tibberton. They appear to be edge of major town locations whereas Tibberton is a rural location. It seems likely that these selected locations have public transport alternatives whereas Tibberton has extremely limited public transport. It is 5.5 miles to Worcester and 4.7 miles to Droitwich but there are no bus services to Droitwich and only a very limited weekday and Saturday service to Worcester and Grafton Flyford. For most Tibberton residents at most times of the day, car travel is the only choice.
- 32 Similarly, the census “journey to work data” which has been used to calculate residential trips is 11 years old and won’t reflect industrial and housing developments since that time – so is very questionable. We can assume most adult occupants of the new 100 houses would work and, due to the lack of public transport alternatives, would likely need to drive to work. As this site is at the north end of the village residents are more likely to go north out of the village over the narrow single vehicle listed bridge rather than south, including commuters using Droitwich railway station. Even if they travel south along Plough Road this will significantly increase traffic numbers along a narrow road not designed for high levels of traffic.
- 33 The appellant claims that current traffic flows through Tibberton at peak morning hours equate to one vehicle every 42 seconds northbound (equivalent to 86 vehicles per hour) and one vehicle every 25 seconds southbound (equivalent to 144 vehicles per hour). This is unrecognisable to the daily experience of villagers living on Plough Road where a figure of 200 to 350 plus vehicles per hour is more typical, particularly at peak times, as reflected in the Community Speed Watch data (see Appendix 1, pp21-38). An additional 100 houses on Plough Meadow will likely mean an average of 2 cars per household so for work, shopping, and other essential travel this will result in several hundred additional car journeys to and from Tibberton each day increasing both traffic problems and the village’s carbon footprint. This is in addition to the resulting increased number of vehicle deliveries to Tibberton (which is not factored into the traffic calculations in the planning application).

- 34 Residents have claimed that the traffic survey undertaken by the appellant on Plough Road to the south of the site for seven days from 25th April 2022 coincided with a period when the Grade II listed bridge was closed for repairs – which naturally would significantly reduce the number vehicles coming into the village and travelling along Plough Road. This raises serious doubts about the validity of the appellant’s traffic data.
- 35 An additional traffic hazard is that vehicles emerging from Hawthorn Rise, Evelench Lane and Foredraught Lane must turn into Plough Road. Further traffic pouring out onto Plough Road from 100 houses on Plough Meadow would make this hazard significantly worse. We note Worcestershire Highways’ concern about *“the extent of vehicle overrun for both the left-in and right-out (in addition to our concerns raised in our formal planning response dated 28 September 2022). For the left in movement, vehicles are shown to require almost all of the opposing lane, which would mean vehicles entering the site would be required to wait on Plough Road if another vehicle was waiting to exit the site. In addition, if vehicles were to be parked in the vicinity of the site access, it would be even more challenging for vehicles entering or leaving the site to do so safely. There is also an increased risk of potential side swipe-type collisions. For right out movements, vehicles would pass in extremely close proximity to the carriageway-edge of the layby.”* We are not convinced these concerns have been resolved by the appellant.
- 36 Tibberton’s traffic levels increase significantly further when there are delays on the M5 or A38 as drivers use Tibberton as an alternative route and this often leads to major congestion through the village. This is an increasingly frequent occurrence and the following images are just some recent examples of the resulting chaos.



Traffic queuing through village centre, Plough Road, when M5 is closed.



Congestion in Plough Road during M5 closures.



37 The appellant has agreed that construction traffic for the development could not negotiate the nearby Grade II listed single-track listed bridge from the north and would need to travel to and from the site from the south end of the village. However, they have severely underestimated the problems this would cause. The site's location means that construction vehicles would need to travel most of the length of Plough Road through the village. Plough Road is a narrow unclassified road. As vehicles approach and enter Tibberton they must negotiate very tight bends, low overhanging trees and poorly visible, near blind entrances onto Church Lane. This is already a problem for traffic and residents but would become significantly worse with high volumes of heavy construction traffic.

- 38 Towards the centre of the village a number of residents need to park their cars on Plough Road because their houses either have no off-road parking or limited off road parking. This is exacerbated by many additional parked cars on Plough Road throughout the day due to school pickups/drop offs, visitors, and deliveries. Consequently, large sections of Plough Road effectively become single track making it difficult sometimes for even cars to pass let alone a plethora of heavy construction vehicles. We see the problems this already causes with delivery vehicles, weekly waste collections and the challenges for the no. 356 bus which passes through the village from the south along Plough Road to the bus stop near the Speed the Plough and then performs a reverse turn into Foredraught Lane to come back through the village to exit. This manoeuvre with a vehicle of this size means that all traffic must halt whilst this procedure takes place. Multiply this by a large number of manoeuvring construction vehicles and there would inevitably be severe bottle neck causing issues further along Plough Road. As the site entrance is also in close proximity to bus stops on either side of the road this is likely to cause either significant hazards for bus pickups or require the bus stops to be relocated though there are no obvious alternative sites in the village.
- 39 At the public consultation meeting the appellant suggested Plough Road could be widened to address the range of access, traffic and safety issues raised by villagers. This is clearly an absurd proposal and simply not possible with the current infrastructure unless all pavements were removed. Nonetheless, this highlights two issues. Firstly that the appellant acknowledges the unsustainable problems the development would cause for the village and traffic flow, but secondly the appellant lacks fundamental understanding of the village and its infrastructure.

Village Infrastructure Problems

- 40 A hundred new houses would put severe additional strain on utilities and local infrastructure which in many instances are already stretched to capacity. A number of significant issues were raised by respondents and despite assurance from the appellant we remain unconvinced by their proposed solutions to infrastructural problems which are speculative, implausible and at best optimistic. These infrastructure issues re-enforce our contention that this proposed development is **unsustainable**.
- a) **Electricity services** - the village has High Voltage Overhead supplies and regularly experiences power cuts due to the fragility of the existing supply. The suggested diversion to underground cabling is speculative and totally impractical - - "an estimated 4 Km network extension is required from a primary substation located to the south-west of site (MS Lighting Trotshill): Further to on-site HV OH diversions, it is anticipated that consideration may be required within the final masterplan for the protection/diversion of LV UG assets shown in the footpath of Plough Road, WPD's asset may be subject to depth of cover changes after construction; early consultation with the asset owner is advised to understand the constraints and costs associated with diverting WPD's asset.

The electrical capacity required will be determined based on the appellant's heating strategy for the new homes. If the proposed heating system is Gas, then the existing 11KV

overhead system may be adequate. However, if as a nation we are fully committed to reducing 'green house' gases and our carbon footprint the use of gas and other fossil fuel forms of heating should be excluded from the development. This will require the use of ground and air source pumps, which together with the requirement for electrical vehicle charging points will require a significant upgrade to the existing village electricity supply, irrespective of any PV panel installations to the properties.

- b) **Gas:** "CGL have confirmed, the nearest main with capacity to support the development is a 90mm LP PE main located approximately 1.7km to the west of the proposed site development, on Bridgwater Road (west of the M5 Junction 6), approximately 1.4km north of the proposed development. It is anticipated that connection works in this location would be complex due to crossing the M5 Motorway. To secure capacity and obtain a detailed connection cost, a formal connections application would need to be submitted to the CGL connections department.

If the use of gas was deemed appropriate the alternative gas supply would be Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG) which would either require individual LPG tanks or several large tanks to provide a district style heating solution. This would however have a detrimental impact on the village's carbon footprint not just from the gas itself but also from the impact of the necessity for deliveries by tanker. This would also add to the highway issues already identified.

- c) **Flooding and Drainage.** The proposed site is ancient marshland which makes it unsuitable for draining surface water. Plough Meadow floods very quickly after any prolonged rain event. The unnamed ordinary watercourse (UOW) to the northeast of the site has been identified to take away pluvial flow. Given that the substrate is Clay / Mudstone and once further compacted by heavy construction plant and vehicles, it will be even less permeable than at present. The plans to alleviate this impact by limiting the areas used by the heavy plant and construction vehicles is in no way realistic. The effect of compaction, buildings and paving/hard surfaces will lead to an increase in flooding episodes in the village. The UOW will not have the capacity to carry away floodwater.

The drainage of the proposed site is so poor that it is understood the late father of the present owners objected some years ago to the expansion of the sewage works which are on the perimeter of this site. It is therefore difficult to see how that same sewage works could now cater for an extra 100 houses. The field regularly floods, and serious flooding of the Speed the Plough and other properties was a regular occurrence until drainage improvements were carried out four or five years ago. There is a real danger that any new development could turn back the clock and lead to extensive local flooding again.

- d) **Flood Risk.** The proposed development will present an unmanageable flood risk, the Developers tacitly recognise that the proposed site is a flood risk (para 2.8 "unfavourable underlying mudstone geology") the suggested proposal does not provide a satisfactory solution (2.1 O - 2.13) to the drainage and flooding problems. Run off water would impact neighbouring land. Heather Shepherd, the flood recovery specialist with the National Flood Forum has stated that, in the light of climate change, "building like mad everywhere"

meant that greater flood risk was becoming more and more common and there was an urgent need for such developments to be cut back. The proposal for Plough Meadow is a perfect example of what the Forum is warning against.

- e) **Potable Water** - the works required to accommodate the development are very substantial (see SWT confirmation (Appendix 5) - " there is not sufficient capacity within the existing infrastructure to provide clean water to the proposed development without significant reinforcement works; it is anticipated that 1500m of 180mm PE will be installed and 50m of 4" AC main will be upgraded on Tibberton Bridge before the point of connection can be offered. Further costs and timescales for the work will be identified at the formal estimate stage.
- f) **Foul Water.** Solutions to Foul Water Disposal (paragraphs 4.1 - 4.3) are also unsatisfactory - "Localised protection/diversion of STW foul water assets may be required to facilitate both site access works and on-site development. Further consultation with STW is advised STW have confirmed, a point of connection to accommodate foul flows can be found within the existing site boundary, both 150mm VC and 375mm VC assets offer a suitable connection, connection to either asset should be made downstream of manhole SO90587001. It has been determined that the proposed foul flows may have a negative impact on the receiving networks, this section should be read in conjunction with the BWB Sustainable Drainage Statement.

41 The problems within Tibberton's sewage infrastructure are particularly resonant. After heavy rain the village sewers fill, there is a discernible unpleasant smell and a number of villagers have experienced raw sewage backing up into their houses and gardens. In January 2023 Tibberton's pumping station (on the perimeter of the proposed site for the 100 homes) failed. This required Severn Trent to urgently deploy tankers to the site and these tankers were camped in the Speed the Plough car park for several days to pump and remove sewage day and night causing considerable unrest and inconvenience. This was widely reported on BBC Hereford and Worcester and in the Worcester News on 12th January (see images below). Before and since then Severn Trent have been frequently observed visiting the pumping station to make continual observations and repairs. This clearly infers ongoing concerns about the pumping station and related system – a point reaffirmed this week when a power cut across the village caused Severn Trent to immediately deploy vehicles to the pumping station.



Tankers in The Plough car park used for taking away sewage from pumping station.



Tankers in The Plough car park used for taking away sewage from pumping station.

- 42 A representative from Severn Trent Water Authority attended a recent Parish Council meeting to discuss the village's sewage issues. They accepted the existing failings of the local sewage system and the problems currently faced by residents. They acknowledged that Severn Trent would be required to upgrade the sewage system to account for the development of 100 new houses but that this may take some considerable time and investment. The Parish Council is therefore gravely concerned that given the acknowledged long running existing sewage problems, a development of 100 houses on this site would make these problems significantly worse, putting an intolerable and unsustainable strain on the waste system infrastructure, causing major health and safety risks for residents.

Poor standard of engagement and material

- 43 Throughout the whole process the appellant has shown a lack of genuine knowledge about Tibberton and an apparent disregard for the village's needs. The only formal engagement made with the village was a public consultation exhibition on 11th May 2022. The Statement of Community Involvement document illustrates the extreme levels of opposition to the proposal, but the documented responses are limited, dealing with very specific issues, and wholly unconvincing. There has been no further attempted contact with the Parish Council or village residents since then nor any engagement and consultation of any kind.
- 44 At the public exhibition, developers seemed woefully unprepared and unable to provide convincing answers to fundamental questions. They seemed unaware of the village's issues with the sewage system, the problems with the Grade II listed bridge or even that, for train travel to Birmingham, residents would normally use the closer Droitwich train station rather than the more distant Worcestershire Parkway station.

- 45 They initially confused Tibberton C of E First school (and pupil numbers) with the much larger Tibberton Primary School in Gloucestershire and had to hastily look up details of the First school on their phones. Throughout their application and appeals documentation, the appellant continues to erroneously describe the school as a primary school (e.g. paragraph 3.6 of the Statement of Case for Hearing document).
- 46 The documentation is also sloppy. We've highlighted just some examples.
- At least two villagers identified the appellant's boundary maps and plans either removed their properties or cut through them.
 - Throughout the Noise Assessment report (from February 2023), the land is described as 'Land at Speed the Plough, Tibberton' whereas in the actual application 22/01565/OUT, the land is referred to as 'Land at Evelench Lane '. On page 6 paragraph 2.8 the report states that consultation was undertaken with Steve Williams of Worcestershire Regulatory Services via an email on 15th November 2023 with a response received on 15th November 2023 (not just the same day but also the future).
 - Noise measurements for location 2 (the site boundary with the busy Plough Road) are reported as being taken between 10.00 – 13.00 on Thursday 16th February. This is a quieter period of the day due to the lack of commuting and school related traffic, which questions the validity of this data. An assessment over two full days may have been more meaningful.
 - The purpose of the Noise Assessment report is the impact on existing noise levels on the proposed housing development – ignoring the impact of the development on existing noise levels. We noted with interest point 3.2 of the report which stated, 'the noise climate was noted to be prevalent in birdsong'. We would contend that building on a site which provides a richly important habitat for birds will significantly reduce birdsong levels.
 - The Noise Assessment report erroneously identifies the site as being "*to the east of Tibberton*" (paragraph 1.5). This is repeated in paragraph 5.16 of the appellant's Statement of Case for Hearing. This is contradicted by a later statement in paragraph 5.22 which argues the proposed development "*...reinforces the nucleus of the village*". So, the development is both to the east of the village but also at its centre!
 - The Landscape Addendum document from 18th May 2023 heavily references the impact on the view from the towpath. However, it omits the impact on the view from other public footpaths in the area – such as the view from Evelench Lane, and the footpaths around the recently planted Community Orchard.

Summary

- 47 Tibberton residents are not “Nimbys”. Tibberton has already met all of its SWDP obligations and has seen significant growth in housing through sensibly planned developments and in-fill housing in the right location and of the right size.
- 48 However, it is clear the appellant is using the current uncertainty regarding the final outcome of the SWDP review to throw in a speculative and ill-conceived planning application which is simply in the wrong location and on the wrong scale. The appellant clearly does not understand the village and the priorities and values of Tibberton residents. Their consultation exhibition meeting and subsequent application contains flawed assumptions and factual errors on issues such as traffic density, lack of public transport, access challenges and the narrow single vehicle listed bridge, impact on habitat, access to local services, healthcare and school places including incorrectly referencing the wrong GP practices and the wrong Tibberton school.
- 49 The Developers have provided no evidence of any benefit of this development to Tibberton and failed to satisfactorily address the significant concerns and points raised repeatedly by residents.

We urge the Inspector to reject this deeply damaging, unjustifiable and inappropriate application.

Chairman, Cllr Robbie Hazlehurst
Tibberton Parish Council
15th June 2023

Tibberton Village, Worcestershire - Speed Watch statistics.

A. Annual Summary for full years 2018 to 2022.

Year	Checked	Reported	Highest speed	Sessions	% speeding	Vehicles/hr
2018	9,681	378	48	56	3.9	173
2019	22,649	644	48	92	2.8	246
2020	11,531	408	48	55	3.5	210
2021	13,570	334	50	56	2.5	242
2022	19,423	517	50	83	2.7	234

B. Tibberton Village Speed Watch Detail from February 2018 to May 2023:

Date	Day	Time	Site	Checked	Reported	Sessions	% speeding
26/02/2018	Monday	14:45 – 15:45	6 - Failand	114	1		
07/03/2018	Wednesday	16:45 – 17:30	6 – Failand	100	1		
08/03/2018	Thursday	07:40 – 08:20	5 – Hawthorn Rise	85	1		
12/04/2018	Thursday	16:30 – 17:30	6 - Failand	240	4		
20/04/2018	Friday	07:30 – 08:30	6 – Failand	106	1		
23/04/2018	Monday	14:45 – 15:45	6 – Failand	135	1		
30/04/2018	Monday	16:35 – 17:30	6 – Failand	200	3		
17/05/2018	Thursday	07:30 – 08:30	5 – Hawthorn Rise	185	2		
18/05/2018	Friday	07:30 – 08:32	5 – Hawthorn Rise	142	6		
23/05/2018	Wednesday	07:40 – 08:35	1 – Inis Cara	161	2		
24/05/2018	Thursday	16:30 – 17:30	3 – Village Hall	221	3		
29/05/2018	Tuesday	07:30 – 08:30	4 – Hillside	72	4		
05/06/2018	Tuesday	08:00 – 09:00	5 – Hawthorn Rise	236	4		
18/06/2018	Monday	16:30 – 17:30	5 – Hawthorn Rise	267	3		
21/06/2018	Thursday	08:30 – 09:30	6 – Failand	145	3		
29/06/2018	Friday	07:20 – 08:35	6 – Failand	228	9		
03/07/2018	Tuesday	16:35 – 17:30	6 - Failand	243	7		
06/07/2018	Friday	7:30 – 8:30	6 - Failand	201	8		
09/07/2018	Monday	17:00 – 18:00	5 – Hawthorn Rise	171	7		
20/07/2018	Friday	16:30 – 17:30	6 - Failand	212	3		
24/07/2018	Tuesday	8:00 – 9:00	6 - Failand	181	4		
27/07/2018	Friday	7:30 – 8:30	5 – Hawthorn Rise	71	1		
10/08/2018	Thursday	7:30 – 8:30	6 - Failand	163	4		
14/08/2018	Tuesday	16:30 – 17:30	6 - Failand	376	2		
24/08/2018	Friday	7:30 – 8:30	6 - Failand	89	2		
30/08/2018	Thursday	16:30 – 17:30	6 - Failand	298	3		
10/09/2018	Monday	7:30 – 8:30	7 – Ash Lane	102	23		
18/09/2018	Tuesday	8:00 – 9:00	6 - Failand	174	1		
21/09/2018	Friday	16:30 – 17:30	6 - Failand	217	0		

Date	Day	Time	Site	Checked	Reported		Sessions	% speeding
24/09/2018	Monday	7:30 – 8:30	7 – Ash Lane	114	19			
27/09/2018	Thursday	16:20 – 17:25	6-Failand	329	1			
03/10/2018	Wednesday	17:00 – 18:00	6-Failand	199	4			
05/10/2018	Friday	07:45 – 08:45	7- Ash Lane	182	12			
11/10/2018	Thursday	16:45 – 17:30	7-Ash Lane	80	4			
16/10/2018	Tuesday	16:35 – 17:30	1-Inis Cara	195	3			
18/10/2018	Thursday	7:45 – 8:45	7- Ash Lane	111	13			
19/10/2018	Friday	16:30 – 17:30	7- Ash Lane	68	13			
22/10/2018	Monday	7:45 – 8:45	7- Ash Lane	143	22			
23/10/2018	Tuesday	16:30 - 17:30	7 – Ash Lane	102	5			
29/10/2018	Monday	7:30 – 8:30	7 – Ash Lane	110	13			
30/10/2018	Tuesday	16:00 – 16:55	6 – Failand	227	1			
31/10/2018	Wednesday	8:00 – 9:00	7 – Ash Lane	210	19			
08/11/2018	Thursday	7:45 – 8:45	7 – Ash Lane	276	7			
09/11/2018	Friday	7:45 – 8:45	7 – Ash Lane	241	14			
12/11/2018	Monday	7:45 – 8:45	7 – Ash Lane	177	12			
14/11/2018	Wednesday	7:45 – 8:45	7 – Ash Lane	255	13			
14/11/2018	Wednesday	15:00 – 16:00	2 – The Plough	80	1			
15/11/2018	Thursday	7:45 – 8:45	7 – Ash Lane	189	8			
16/11/2018	Friday	15:00 = 16:00	6 – Failand	252	0			
19/11/2018	Monday	7:45 – 8:45	7 – Ash Lane	216	10			
26/11/2018	Monday	8:00 – 9:00	7 – Ash Lane	78	11			
29/11/2018	Thursday	15:00 = 16:00	7 – Ash Lane	172	6			
06/12/2018	Thursday	8:15 – 9:00	7 – Ash Lane	167	8			
10/12/2018	Monday	8:15 – 9:00	7 – Ash Lane	73	16			
12/12/2018	Wednesday	8:15 – 9:15	7 – Ash Lane	121	5			
20/12/2018	Thursday	8:15 – 9:15	7 – Ash Lane	179	25			
				9681	378		56	3.9
Date	Day	Time	Site	Checked	Reported	Top Speed	Sessions	% speeding
08/01/2019	Tuesday	8:15 – 9:15	7 – Ash Lane	158	6			
10/01/2019	Thursday	8:15 – 9:15	7 – Ash Lane	100	6			
15/01/2019	Tuesday	8:15 – 9:15	6 – Failand	160	0			
21/01/2019	Monday	8:00 – 9:00	7 – Ash Lane	95	9			
25/01/2019	Friday	8:00 – 9:00	6 – Failand	285	0			
28/01/2019	Monday	8:00 – 9:00	7 – Ash Lane	201	5			
				999	26		6	2.6
05/02/2019	Tuesday	8:00 – 9:00	7 – Ash Lane	238	10			
08/02/2019	Friday	13:15 – 13:30	3 – Village Hall	13	1			
12/02/2019	Tuesday	8:00 – 9:00	7 – Ash Lane	252	7			
15/02/2019	Friday	16.10 – 17.10	6 – Failand	380	0			
18/02/2019	Monday	7:45 – 8:45	7- Ash Lane	109	11			
20/02/2019	Wednesday	7:45 – 8:45	7- Ash Lane	182	14			

22/02/2019	Friday	16:30 – 17:30	6- Failand	337	5			
25/02/2019	Monday	7:30 -8:30	7- Ash Lane	78	17			
			February	1589	65		8	4.1
06/03/2019	Wednesday	7:40 - 8:45	7- Ash Lane	307	11			
11/03/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7- Ash Lane	213	10			
12/03/2019	Tuesday	16:00 - 16:40	6-Failand	267	1			
15/03/2019	Friday	7:45-8:45	7-Ash Lane	118	11			
22/03/2019	Friday	16:40 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	236	3			
25/03/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7- Ash Lane	222	11			
29/03/2019	Friday	7:45 - 8:45	7-Ash Lane	205	6			
			March	1568	53		7	3.4
Date	Day	Time	Site	Checked	Reported	Top Speed	Sessions	% speeding
16/04/2019	Tuesday	7:40 - 8:45	7-Ash Lane	193	13			
18/04/2019	Thursday	7:45 - 8:45	8 - Church Lane	88	4			
23/04/2019	Tuesday	17:00 - 18:00	8 - Church Lane	300	11			
29/04/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	2 - The Plough	230	1			
			April	811	29		4	3.6
01/05/2019	Wednesday	7:45 - 8:45	7-Ash Lane	474	12			
08/05/2019	Wednesday	17:00 - 18:00	6-Failand	364	3			
13/05/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7-Ash Lane	262	13			
16/05/2019	Thursday	17:00 - 18:00	8 - Church Lane	283	17			
20/05/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7- Ash Lane	232	11			
24/05/2019	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	428	9			
28/05/2019	Tuesday	7:30 - 8:30	7- Ash Lane	192	12			
31/05/2019	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	355	7			
			May	2590	84		8	3.2
03/06/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7- Ash Lane	280	8			
05/06/2019	Wednesday	7:30 - 8:30	6-Failand	357	1			
12/06/2019	Wednesday	8:00 - 9:00	6-Failand	438	1			
14/06/2019	Friday	17:00 - 18:00	6-Failand	273	0			
17/06/2019	Monday	7:50 - 8:50	7-Ash Lane	442	10			
20/06/2019	Thursday	8:00 - 9:00	7- Ash Lane	318	8			
21/06/2019	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	331	3			
24/06/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7- Ash Lane	355	5			
27/06/2019	Thursday	15:00 - 16:00	6-Failand	290	0			
			June	3084	36		9	1.2

Date	Day	Time	Site	Checked	Reported	Top Speed	Sessions	% speeding
02/07/2019	Tuesday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	372	9			
05/07/2019	Friday	17:00 - 18:00	8 - Church Lane	320	8			
08/07/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7 -Ash Lane	314	8			
11/07/2019	Thursday	18:00 - 19:00	8 - Church Lane	164	10			
13/07/2019	Saturday	11:00 - 12:00	3 - Village Hall	120	2			
16/07/2019	Tuesday	7:30 - 8:30	7 -Ash Lane	310	14			
23/07/2019	Tuesday	8:00 - 9:00	7 -Ash Lane	224	16			
26/07/2019	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	299	11			
29/07/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	2- The Plough	161	1			
31/07/2019	Wednesday	17:30 - 18:30	1- Inis Cara	313	6			
			July	2597	85		10	3.3

05/08/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	2- the Plough	153	1			
08/08/2019	Friday	17:20 - 18.20	8 - Church Lane	307	10			
12/08/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7 -Ash Lane	199	18			
14/08/2019	Wednesday	18:00 - 19:00	8 - Church Lane	152	7			
15/08/2019	Thursday	16:30 - 17:30	1- Inis Cara	298	3			
17/08/2019	Saturday	14:40-15:30	3 - Village Hall	98	0			
21/08/2019	Wednesday	17:00 - 18:00	8 - Church Lane	321	7			
23/08/2019	Friday	7:30 - 8:30	4 - Hillside	93	1			
27/08/2019	Tuesday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	290	5			
28/08/2019	Wednesday	7:45 - 8:30	2 - The Plough	117	0			
30/08/2019	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	1 - Inis Cara	224	4			
			August	2252	56		11	2.5
02/09/2019	Monday	7:15 - 8:15		190	0			
05/09/2019	Thursday	13:10 - 14:10	3 - Village Hall	128	2			
12/09/2019	Thursday	8:00 - 9:00	6- Failand	394	1			
16/09/2019	Monday	17:00 - 18:00	1 - Inis Cara	346	5			
18/09/2019	Wednesday	17:30 - 18:30	7 - Ash Lane	119	20			
20/09/2019	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	336	13			
23/09/2019	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	353	15			
24/09/2019	Tuesday	18:00 - 19:00	6 - Failand	158	1			
27/09/2019	Friday	17:30 - 18:30	7 - Ash Lane	130	25			
30/09/2019	Monday	8:00 - 9:00	1 - Inis Cara	150	1			
			September	2304	83		10	3.6

October								
01/10/2019	Tuesday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	369	4	40		
04/10/2019	Friday	17:00 - 18:00	8 - Church lane	272	9	48		
09/10/2019	Wednesday	14:30 - 15:30	6 - Failand	343	2	35		
11/10/2019	Friday	7:45 - 8:45	8 - Church lane	221	6	41		
14/10/2019	Monday	7:45 - 8:45	8 - Church lane	180	11	41		
17/10/2019	Thursday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Ash Lane	191	14	42		
23/10/2019	Wednesday	11:00 - 12:00	3 - Village Hall	180	5	38		
24/10/2019	Thursday	16:25 - 17:30	7 - Ash Lane	205	12	43		
28/10/2019	Monday	7:45 - 8:45	7 - Ash Lane	193	10	38		
31/10/2019	Thursday	16:00 - 16 :45	8 - Church Lane	238	4	44		
			October	2392	77	48	10	3.2
07/11/2019	Thursday	15:30 - 16:30	8 - Church lane	285	5	40 (55 South)		
12/11/2019	Tuesday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	271	6	39		
13/11/2019	Wednesday	12:00 - 13:00	3 - Village Hall	150	2	36		
15/11/2019	Friday	15:15 - 16:15	6 - Failand	290	0			
18/11/2019	Monday	7:30-8:30	7 - Ash Lane	293	9	41		
20/11/2019	Wednesday	7:45 - 8:45	8 - Church lane	225	5	40		
28/11/2019	Thursday	14:00 - 15:00	6 - Failand	244	2	35		
29/11/2019	Friday	15:00 - 16:00	8 - Church lane	324	8	44		
			November	2082	37	44	8	1.8
09/12/2019	Monday	8:15 - 9:15	7 - Ash Lane	381	13	41	1	3.4
			Totals for 2019	22649	644	48	92	2.8
								246

Date	Day	Time	Site	Checked	Reported	TOP speed	Sessions	% speeding	Av Vehicles/h r
13/01/2020	Monday	8:15 - 9:15	7 - Ash Lane	312	12	43			
15/01/2020	Wednesday	13:30 -14:30	3 - Village Hall	145	0	0			
17/01/2020	Friday	15:30 -16:30	6 - Failand	327	1	35			
20/01/2020	Monday		7 - Ash Lane	316	10	45			
22/01/2020	Wednesday	3:30 - 4:30	1 - Innis Cara	250	1	35			
27/01/2020	Monday	7:45 - 8:45	7 - Ash Lane	392	8	42			
			January	1742	32	45	6	1.8	290
05/02/2020	Wednesday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	249	6	37			
07/02/2020	Friday	16:15 - 17:15	8 - Church Lane	338	6	39			
10/02/2020	Monday	7:45 - 8:45	1 - Inis Cara	192	0	0			
14/02/2020	Friday	15:30-14:00	8 - Church Lane	125	4	37			
17/02/2020	Monday	7:45 - 8:45	7 - Ash Lane	98	9	42			
20/02/2020	Thursday	15:00 - 16:00	6 - Failand	178	3	40			
25/02/2020	Tuesday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	183	9	40			
			February	1363	37	42	7	2.7	195
06/03/2020	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	6 - Failand	300	5	39			
10/03/2020	Tuesday	14:30 - 15:30	2 - The Plough	227	2	35			
			March	527	7	39	2	1.3	264
25/05/2020	Monday (bank holiday)	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	49	14	48		28.6	
27/05/2020	Wednesday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	172	6	36		3.5	
08/06/2020	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	140	17	46		12.1	
10/06/2020	Wednesday	15:50 - 17:00	6 - Failand	155	1	36		0.6	
23/06/2020	Tuesday	15:50 - 17:00	8 - Church Lane	295	10	40		3.4	
25/06/2020	Thursday	8:00 - 9:00	1- Inis Cara	153	1	37		0.7	
			May - June	964	49	48	6	5.1	161
13/07/2020	Monday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	175	8	48		4.6	
16/07/2020	Thursday	8:00 - 9:00	6 - Failand	140	2	39		1.4	
20/07/2020	Monday	6:20 - 7:30	6 - Failand	84	3	37		3.6	
21/07/2020	Tuesday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	237	19	45		8.0	
24/07/2020	Friday	16:00 - 17:00	7 - Ash Lane	216	16	47		7.4	
29/07/2020	Wednesday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	116	9	45		7.8	
31/07/2020	Friday	8:00 - 9:00	8 - Church Lane	168	8	37		4.8	
			July	1136	65	47	7	5.7	162
03/08/2020	Monday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	145	16	48		11.0	
07/08/2020	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	210	13	39		6.2	
11/08/2020	Tuesday	8:30 - 9:30	6 - Failand	129	2	37		1.6	
13/08/2020	Thursday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	272	9	45		3.3	
17/08/2020	Monday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	158	11	44		7.0	
18/08/2020	Tuesday	7:00 -8:00	3 - Village Hall	97	2	35		2.1	
21/08/2020	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	269	9	45		3.3	
			August	1280	62	48	8	4.8	160
04/09/2020	Friday	16:23 - 17:23	8 - Church Lane	298	12	37		4.0	
08/09/2020	Tuesday	7:00 - 8:00	2-The Plough	174	3	37		1.7	
11/09/2020	Friday	16:00 - 17:00	8 - Church Lane	298	10	40		3.4	
16/09/2020	Wednesday	8:00 -9:00	6 - Failand	276	2	35		0.7	
18/09/2020	Friday	7:30-8:30	7 -Ash Lane	258	16	48		6.2	
21/09/2020	Monday	16:00 - 17:00	6 - Failand	284	6	40		2.1	
24/09/2020	Thursday	8:00 -9:00	7 -Ash Lane	301	15	41		5.0	
30/09/2020	Wednesday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	320	9	44		2.8	
			September	2209	73	48	8	3.3	272

10/09/2021	Friday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	305	4	38		1.3	
13/09/2021	Monday	7:00 - 8:00	8 - Church Lane	212	6	38		2.8	
15/09/2021	Wednesday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	271	5	37		1.8	
20/09/2021	Monday	16:50 - 17:50	8 - Church Lane	337	7	43		2.1	
23/09/2021	Thursday	8:00 - 9:00	2 - The Plough	255	0	34		0.0	
28/09/2021	Tuesday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	355	10	43		2.8	
				1735	32	43	6	1.8	289
06/10/2021	Wednesday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	320	14	41		4.4	
08/10/2021	Friday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	290	5	37		1.7	
12/10/2021	Tuesday	8:00 - 9:00	2 - Speed the Plough	411	0	34		0.0	
15/10/2021	Friday	8:30 - 9:30	7 - Ash Lane	178	14	45		7.9	
21/10/2021	Thursday	4:00 - 5:00	6 - Failand	236	1	37		0.4	
25/10/2021	Monday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	179	5	39		2.8	
29/10/2021	Friday	16:50 - 17:50	8 - Church Lane	265	12	40		4.5	
				1879	51	45	7	2.7	268
05/11/2021	Friday	7:30 - 8:30	7 - Ash Lane	235	4	40		1.7	
08/11/2021	Monday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	297	6	38		2.0	
12/11/2021	Friday	14:30 - 15:30	2 - The Plough	203	0	0		0.0	
17/11/2021	Wednesday	8:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	230	8	44		3.5	
19/11/2021	Friday	15:00 - 16:00	8 - Church Lane	266	5	39		1.9	
25/11/2021	Thursday	14:30 - 15:30	6 - Failand	205	1	41		0.5	
29/11/2021	Monday	8:30 - 9:30	7 - Ash Lane	205	2	36		1.0	
				1641	26	44	7	1.6	234
January									
13/01/2022	Thursday	8:30 - 9:30	7 - Ash Lane	200	10	41		5.0	
15/01/2022	Saturday	14:00 - 15:00	6 - Failand	141	0			0.0	
18/01/2022	Tuesday	14:30 - 15:30	1 - Inis Cara	154	1	36		0.6	
20/01/2022	Thursday	8:30 - 9:30	7 - Ash Lane	204	7	37		3.4	
21/01/2022	Friday	15:30 - 16:30	8 - Church Lane	209	6	39		2.9	
24/01/2022	Monday	8:30 - 9:30	8 - Church Lane	235	1	36		0.4	
25/01/2022	Tuesday	8:30 - 9:30	7 - Ash Lane	181	9	48		5.0	
29/01/2022	Saturday	13:00 - 14:00	6 - Failand	179	2	37		1.1	
				1503	36	48	8	2.4	188
February									
02/02/2022	Wednesday	14:00 - 15:00	6 - Failand	124	1	36		0.8	
04/02/2022	Friday	15:30 - 16:30	7 - Ash Lane	220	11	39		5.0	
07/02/2022	Monday	08:30 - 09:30	7 - Ash Lane	227	11	41		4.8	
11/02/2022	Friday	16:00 - 17:00	8 - Church Lane	220	9	44		4.1	
12/02/2022	Saturday	10:00 - 11:00	1 - Inis Cara	127	3	38		2.4	
17/02/2022	Thursday	16:00 - 17:00	8 - Church Lane	208	8	40		3.8	
23/02/2022	Wednesday	08:00 - 09:00	7 - Ash Lane	162	7	42		4.3	
25/02/2022	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	2 - Village Hal	255	4	36		1.6	
				1543	54	44	8	3.5	193
March									
04/03/2022	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	260	7	40		2.7	
07/03/2022	Monday	08:00 - 09:00	7 - Ash Lane	293	5	41		1.7	
15/03/2022	Tuesday	16:30 - 17:30	1 - Inis Cara	228	4	39		1.8	
17/03/2022	Thursday	07:53 - 09:01	7 - Ash Lane	335	8	49		2.4	
23/03/2022	Wednesday	08:00 - 09:00	7 - Ash Lane	252	3	36		1.2	
25/03/2022	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	3 - Village Hall	252	2	39		0.8	
28/03/2022	Monday	14:30 - 15:30	6 - Failand	174	0			0.0	
30/03/2022	Wednesday	08:30 - 09:30	7 - Ash Lane	245	7	40		2.9	
				2039	36	49	8	1.8	255

April									
05/04/2022	Tuesday	14:30 - 15:30	5 - Hawthorn Rise	208	2	36		1.0	
07/04/2022	Thursday	17:00 - 18:00	8 - Church Lane	314	4	42		1.3	
14/04/2022	Thursday	8:00 - 9:00	2 - Speed the Plough	169	0			0.0	
20/04/2022	Wednesday	08:30 - 09:30	7 - Ash Lane	230	9	43		3.9	
22/04/2022	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	3 - Village hall	267	9	41		3.4	
26/04/2022	Tuesday	08:00 - 09:00	7 - Ash Lane	310	8	41		2.6	
29/04/2022	Friday	08:30 - 09:30	7 - Ash Lane	264	17	43		6.4	
				1762	49	43	7	2.8	252
May									
13/05/2022	Friday	16:50 - 17:50	8 - Church Lane	274	11	40		4.0	
16/05/2022	Monday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	323	9	40		2.8	
18/05/2022	Wednesday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	430	11	40		2.6	
20/05/2022	Friday	16:20 - 17:20	8 - Church Lane	291	7	41		2.4	
24/05/2022	Tuesday	14:55 - 15:55	5 - Hawthorn Rise	205	3	38		1.5	
27/05/2022	Friday	08:00 - 09:00	1 - Inis Cara	237	0			0.0	
30/05/2022	Monday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	166	11	40		6.6	
				1926	52	41	7	2.7	275
June									
09/06/2022	Thursday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	300	6	36		2.0	
14/06/2022	Tuesday	08:00 - 09:00	7 - Ash Lane	280	12	41		4.3	
17/06/2022	Friday	17:00 - 18:00	8 - Church Lane	390	21	47		5.4	
19/06/2022	Sunday	10:30 - 11:30	6 - Failand	139	1	36		0.7	
21/06/2022	Tuesday	08:00 - 09:00	5 - Hawthorn Rise	205	2	36		1.0	
24/06/2022	Friday	14:45 - 15:25	8 - Church Lane	171	2	36		1.2	
28/06/2022	Tuesday	08:00 - 09:00	8 - Church Lane	250	6	49		2.4	
30/06/2022	Thursday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	275	12	47		4.4	
				2010	62	49	8	3.1	251
July									
12/07/2022	Tuesday	07:20 - 08:20	7 - Ash Lane	265	10	49		3.8	
15/07/2022	Friday	08:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	225	16	41		7.1	
22/07/2022	Friday	15:00 - 16:00	8 - Church Lane	210	5	41		2.4	
25/07/2022	Monday	07:50 - 08:50	7 - Ash Lane	227	8	41		3.5	
28/07/2022	Thursday	11:00 - 12:00	1 - Inis Cara	115	2	37		1.7	
30/07/2022	Saturday	10:00 - 11:00	6 - Failand	125	0			0.0	
				1167	41	49	6	3.5	195
August									
02/08/2022	Tuesday	08:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash lane	187	7	40		3.7	
04/08/2022	Thursday	08:00 - 9:00	6 - Failand	168	2	45		1.2	
08/08/2022	Monday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	245	13	40		5.3	
12/08/2022	Friday	08:30 - 09:30	3 - Village Hall	121	5	43		4.1	
15/08/2022	Monday	08:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash lane	240	8	42		3.3	
17/08/2022	Wednesday	17:00 - 18:00	8 - Church Lane	253	9	39		3.6	
24/08/2022	Wednesday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	151	1	35		0.7	
				1365	45	45	7	3.3	195
September									
05/09/2022	Monday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	200	10	44		5.0	
07/09/2022	Wednesday	08:00 - 9:00	8 - Church Lane	255	3	39		1.2	
13/09/2022	Tuesday	07:30 - 08:30	1 - Inis Cara	217	4	43		1.8	
16/09/2022	FRIDAY	08:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	269	9	46		3.3	
21/09/2022	Wednesday	08:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	330	7	37		2.1	
22/09/2022	Thursday	16:00 - 17:00	8 - Church Lane	431	11	42		2.6	
24/09/2022	Saturday	10:30 - 11:30	6 - Failand	182	1	42		0.5	
26/09/2022	Monday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	265	5	40		1.9	
				2149	50	46	8	2.3	269

October							
03/10/2022	Monday	07:20 - 08:20	7 - Ash Lane	281	10	41	3.6
07/10/2022	Friday	17:00 - 18:00	8 - Church Lane	258	9	41	3.5
11/10/2022	Tuesday	08:00 - 09:00	5 - Hawthorn Rise	315	1	38	0.3
14/10/2022	Friday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	276	12	44	4.3
19/10/2022	Wednesday	08:00 - 09:00	7 - Ash Lane	340	10	45	2.9
20/10/2022	Thursday	16:00 - 17:00	8 - Church Lane	292	5	37	1.7
24/10/2022	Monday	08:15 - 09:15	6 - Failand	181	2	35	1.1
				1943	49	45	2.5
						7	278
November							
01/11/2022	Tuesday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	172	12	50	7.0
04/11/2022	Friday	15:30 - 16:30	8 - Church Lane	156	9	39	5.8
07/11/2022	Monday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	217	7	41	3.2
08/11/2022	Tuesday	15:15 - 16:15	6 - Failand	191	3	44	1.6
11/11/2022	FRIDAY	08:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	285	6	48	2.1
16/11/2022	Wednesday	08:30 - 09:30	1 - Inis Cara	200	0		0.0
18/11/2022	Friday	15:00 - 16:00	8 - Church Lane	245	4	42	1.6
25/11/2022	Monday	08:00 - 9:00	1 - Inis Cara	275	0		0.0
30/11/2022	Wednesday	08:00 - 9:00	7 - Ash Lane	275	2	45	0.7
				2016	43	50	2.1
						9	224
			Totals for 2022	19423	517	50	83
							2.7
							234
			Totals for 2019	22,649	664	48	92
			Totals for 2020	11,531	408	48	55
			Totals for 2021	13,570	334	50	56
			Totals for 2022	19,423	517	50	83
							2.7
							234

Feb-23							
01/02/2023	Wednesday	08:30 - 09:30	1 - Inis Cara	119	1	36	0.8
03/02/2023	Friday	14:30 - 15:30	6 - Failand	203	1	35	0.5
08/02/2023	Wednesday	08:00 - 09:00	7 - Ash Lane	237	7	44	3.0
09/02/2023	Thursday	14:30 - 15:30	6 - Failand	243	1	36	0.4
13/02/2023	Monday	08:00 - 09:00	7 - Ash Lane	285	7	39	2.5
17/02/2023	Friday	15:50 - 16:50`	8 - Church Lane	262	11	42	4.2
22/02/2023	Wednesday	07:45 - 08:45	7 - Ash Lane	180	6	40	3.3
29/02/2023	Monday	07:55 - 09:00	7 - Ash Lane	283	6	38	2.1
				1,812	40	44	2.2
						8	227
Mar-23							
10/03/2023	Friday	16:00 - 17:00	8 - Church Lane	213	7	37	3.3
16/03/2023	Thursday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	237	7	38	3.0
22/03/2023	Wednesday	16:55 - 17:55	8 - Church Lane	260	5	39	1.9
24/03/2023	Friday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	191	10	39	5.2
29/03/2023	Wednesday	07:30 - 08:30	7 - Ash Lane	290	11	42	3.8
				1191	40	42	3.4
						5	238

Apr-23									
06/04/2023	Thursday	08:00 - 09:00	3 - Parish Hall	112	3	39		2.7	
17/04/2023	Monday	07:30 - 08:30	7- Ash Lane	315	16	47		5.1	
20/04/2023	Thursday	07:30 - 08:30	7- Ash Lane	286	5	45		1.7	
25/04/2023	Tuesday	08:00 - 09:00	5 - Hawthorn Rise	239	0			0.0	
28/04/2023	Friday	07:30 - 08:30	7- Ash Lane	285	9	45		3.2	
				1237	33	47	5	2.7	247
May-23									
12/05/2023	Friday	08:00 - 09:00	6- Failand	230	1	35		0.4	
15/05/2023	Monday	07:30 - 08:30	7-Ash Lane	247	12	42		4.9	
17/05/2023	Wednesday	07:30 - 08:30	7-Ash Lane	348	19	42		5.5	
22/05/2023	Monday	07:30 - 08:30	7-Ash Lane	285	15	38		5.3	
24/05/2023	Wednesday	16:30 - 17:30	8 - Church Lane	300	18	46		6.0	
25/05/2023	Thursday	07:30 -08:30	7- Ash Lane	280	12	51		4.3	
30/05/2023	Tuesday	08:00 - 09:00	3 - Village Hall	150	3	36		2.0	
				1840	80	51	7	4.3	263