

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future

Solihull Local Plan Review

Draft Local Plan –Summary of Individual Representations by Question

July 2019

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Question 1. Local Housing Need			
Q01	Albanwise Ltd [6247]	Barton Willmore (Mr Daniel G Wilson) [5480]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plan period end date should be extended to 2036 to align with GL Hearn Strategic Growth Study - Plan may be delayed, and will ensure a minimum 15 year time horizon - Cites Para. 60-61 of NPPF on housing need assumptions - Urge SMBC suitably considers
Q01	Andrea Baker [3471]		Solihull has had an affordability issue for many years - I was born and raised here, and returned to raise my own family following graduation and my marriage. Building thousands of houses, whether so called 'affordable' houses or not, will not help this, forcing people to move to an area of high density, with poor infrastructure and transport facilities will lead to community adhesion issues and isolation
Q01	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		<p>Balsall parish has exceptional circumstances that justify an alternative approach.</p> <p>The draft Balsall Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan contains Community Aspiration CA1: 'Development on allocated Solihull Local Plan housing sites that will utilise the same construction routes as HS2 contractors should be avoided at the same time as HS2 construction because of the potential disruption to existing residents caused by avoidable increased congestion.'</p> <p>This consideration affects Frog Lane and Windmill Lane sites.</p>
Q01	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Support proposed housing distribution, review of green belt boundaries and reassessment of washed over green belt settlements. Object to lack of justification/agreement for scale of contribution to wider HMA shortfall. Insufficient deliverable residential site allocations identified which comply with site selection criteria and national policy recommendations. Plan should be future proofed by allocating land for more houses than recommended by standard methodology, recognising it is a minimum starting point and need to boost house building. More small and medium sized viable sites need to be allocated.</p> <p>Housing Delivery Test misleading given lack of objectively assessed need in SLP2013 and DLP requirement. Requires 20% buffer and/or Action Plan.</p> <p>Despite use of Standard Methodology based on 2014 household projections, there is still no signed Statement of Common Ground, contrary to NPPF.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Birmingham City Council (Mr Martin Dando) [5352]		BCC has concerns that this Consultation does not specifically address any potential revision to the contribution that Solihull is making towards the HMA shortfall. A large amount of evidence has come forward since the last consultation and therefore scenarios which test the validity of the existing spatial strategy and the possibility of significantly higher housing provision and growth have yet to be fully considered and assessed. Assurance is required that this course of action has been fully considered and implemented prior to Submission Draft Plan stage.
Q01	Bloor Homes [6243]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	No exceptional circumstances that would justify the Council using an alternative approach. Support the Council's use of the 2014 based household projections in their LHN calculations. However, the figures result in a contribution of only 24 dwellings per annum to the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area. This is not sufficient to meet the shortfall
Q01	Bromsgrove District Council (M Dunphy) [3927]		Concerns remain over lack of clear justification for commitment to provide for 2,000 dwellings towards wider HMA needs. Figure not agreed by HMA authorities and is not a firm basis for development strategy and site allocations. This is a fundamental issue that will need to be addressed in Statement of Common Ground, have the support of HMA authorities and be based on an apportionment methodology. Addressing this at Submission stage is too late in process as this will have significant implications for the development strategy, and knock on effects for neighbouring areas. Urge progression of Statement of Common Ground.
Q01	Catesby Estates Limited [3038]	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Use of the 2014 Household Projections and standard methodology is considered appropriate. However, this figure should be a minimum. It is also imperative that Solihull not only meets its own targets but also provides for an agreed amount of housing to fulfil a proportion of the unmet housing need arising from the wider HMA. It is an accepted position that Solihull MBC has failed to meet the (now quashed) housing target set out in the current Solihull Local Plan. To address this, supply should be frontloaded. Failure to respond to SGS means Plan not underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence
Q01	Councillor J Tildesley [2119]		Solihull can only grow to a certain size due to limited land available. Birmingham must do more to meet its own housing need.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>There are exceptional circumstances: Level of housing proposed is not deliverable. More significant HMA contribution required but offset by reduction in Q01 figure. Use lower household projections as baseline. Deliver more affordable housing numbers in exchange for flexibility in overall requirement. Demographic composition of Borough residents means significant requirement for retirement/extra-care exempt from affordable housing provisions, which limits downsizing, which is confined to least affordable properties. Need addressing together to ensure avoid spate of house building that does not address need whilst protecting more of the green belt.</p>
Q01	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		<p>The standard methodology has landed us with a housing crisis. Too many expensive houses which are unaffordable (e.g. £200,000 houses in new development at Arran Way, Smith's Wood), plus a proliferation of social housing in certain Wards. Social and Co-operative housing needs to be the priority - people and communities must prevail over private profit. In addition, affordable private housing (market prices of below £90,000) should also be sought. This will be difficult, but that is the job of the Plan to alleviate the issues we are facing. We cannot go on as normal; 'normal' is failing our residents.</p>
Q01	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	<p>The standard methodology adopted to find the Q01 for the Development Plan accords with both the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy Guidance. This methodology takes account of the Borough's needs and those of neighbouring Authorities, who are unable to meet their own needs. There are, therefore, no exceptional circumstances that would warrant an alternative approach to be adopted or factors that mean that the standard methodology would require additional adjustment.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>SM is not suitable basis for assessing housing need in Solihull, as it is based on assumption that there is no constraint to meeting full requirement.</p> <p>NPPF is clear that Green Belt is a reason to restrict development in the plan area (FN5 to Para. 11). Most of undeveloped land in Solihull is Green Belt.</p> <p>Meriden Gap performs important function in separating cities of Birmingham and Coventry, and has been protected in successive local plans and regional strategies.</p> <p>Furthermore, there is a lot of commuting in and out of the Borough which makes it difficult to assess Q01.</p> <p>Alternative method would be a capacity-led local plan strategy.</p> <p>No justification for 2000 contribution to HMA shortfall.</p> <p>No formal agreement on HMA contribution.</p> <p>Proposed housing growth far exceeds household projections. Borough has not achieved that level of growth in the past.</p> <p>Capacity in the Plan to meet need up to 2031 without releasing further Green Belt if meet household projections only.</p> <p>Plan should allocate more small sites of 1-5ha rather than focusing on fewer, larger sites.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>The objectively assessed need identified through the standard methodology cannot be met in Solihull without undermining the green belt. Knowle conservation area is the most important conservation area in the Borough. Proposals to surround Knowle to the north and south east would undermine the Conservation areas character and setting. Knowle would become a town in terms of population and urban context. Conservation areas like green belt as one of the grounds in NPPF footnote 6 for restricting development below the objectively assessed need. A further exceptional circumstance which justifies a different approach is the degree to which the Borough is the location for a large number of jobs taken by people who do not live there. The extent of commuting in and out of Solihull makes estimating Q01 difficult. The conclusion to draw is that Solihull's housing provision should not include provision for more than 50% of those who work in the Borough but should include some provision for the needs of Birmingham, whilst this may appear paradoxical it reflects the reality of the employment. The alternative to the standard methodology is capacity led. The level of housing should in principle be limited to urban capacity on land which is not green belt or which would not undermine specific village character. There is scope for changes to green belt boundaries in locations which do not affect the openness and rural character of the Meriden Gap and Knowle village. There is no justification for the commitment to take 2,000 dwellings from the wider HMA, not aware that the Council has reached any agreement with adjoining Councils. Rate of housing delivery suggested in the consultation document is far above any completions except in 2005. it is double the rate of housing completions over the past ten years and above the cap that would apply if the standard method were to be used to calculate Solihull's own Q01. The proposed housing policy is not sound as it is not deliverable or achievable from past evidence. Should use 2016 ONS household projections to indicate the most likely household growth in the Borough. This is 550 households or 9350 over 17 years 2018 - 2035 and would be achievable within the constraints of the green belt and Knowle conservation area. On this basis there is capacity for 13 years up until 2031 without needing new allocated sites which are Green Belt</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	<p>Barton Willmore Housing Need Technical Note to SDEPR.</p> <p>Summary of findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The revised NPPF introduces the Standard Method (SM) for calculating housing need, the relevant Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) has been amended (February 2019) to state that the 2014-based MHCLG projections must be used for the calculation, and not the 2016-based ONS projections. The current SM calculated housing need figure for Solihull stands at 777 dwellings per annum (dpa) as of March 2019; * Notwithstanding this, revised Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states the SM figure represents the minimum housing need, and actual need may be higher; * The Supplementary Consultation document identifies the clear economic growth aspirations for the Borough, including the significant development planned for High Speed 2 and the Interchange in the Borough. Housing delivery must be of a quantum to support these aspirations; * Alongside this, the Council need to consider the aspirations of the GBSLEP in which they are located; * The Council's evidence base provides a relatively recent (January 2017) assessment of baseline job growth prospects for Solihull, post-Brexit referendum, alongside a scenario which takes into account the potential job growth created by the HS2 Hub Interchange; * These scenarios show annual job growth of between 800 and 1,080 jobs per annum. It is therefore imperative that the housing requirement for Solihull supports at least 800 jobs per annum, and more realistically the upper end of this range.; * Our own sensitivity testing has established how the baseline population growth used to underpin the Standard Method would only support circa 450 jobs per annum; * Furthermore the final Standard Method housing figure (777 dpa) would only support between 594 and 729 jobs per annum; <p>To support the range of job growth identified in PBA's 2017 report (baseline job growth of 800 per annum, and job growth to support the UK Hub of 1,080 jobs per annum), housing need for the Borough alone would need to be between 825 and 1,127 dpa;</p> <p>* There is significant unmet need from the GBSLEP. Solihull Borough Council</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	<p>Barton Willmore Housing Need Technical Note</p> <p>Summary of Finding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Government have reiterated that the SM represents 'minimum' housing need, and it should represent the 'starting point' for planning; * Revised PPG confirms that 'actual housing need may be higher' than the SM minimum; * Revised NPPF states how inadequate housing should not form a barrier to investment; * Recent technical consultation responses confirm Government's stance that 2014-based household projections are to be used for the SM and not the 2016-based projections; * Revised PPG confirms that the 2016-based ONS household projections cannot be used as an 'exceptional circumstance' to justify a minimum housing need figure below SM; * The Standard Method will be revised within the next 18 months. * Barton Willmore have tested the level of housing required to support the range of job growth published by PBA's Employment Land Review (Jan 2017). This shows need of between 825 and 926 dwellings per annum over the Plan period, just to meet the baseline level of job growth set out in the Council's Employment Land Review. * To achieve the UK Hub scenario, between 1,019 and 1,127 dwellings per annum would be required. N.B. The UK Hub scenario is considered to be a conservative projection in the context of historic job growth, and should be at least 1,225 jobs p.a. not 1,080. * Additionally, Solihull has a duty to deliver a share of the unmet need from the wider HMA, which ranges from 28,000 up to 2031 to 80,000 up to 2036 on the basis of recent evidence base documents in the public domain.
Q01	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		we agree with the council's view on using the standard methodology to arrive at the Q01.
Q01	Duchy Homes Ltd [6036]	Barton Willmore Planning (Miss Hiteshree Kundalia) [6035]	<p>Given the findings of the Employment Land Review (2017), we query whether there is adequate evidence regarding employment needs to answer this question.</p> <p>There is scope for an uplift in the housing requirement as a result of the HS2-related growth, as well the potential to capitalise on the clear need for wider than local employment growth identified through evidence such as the 2015 West Midlands Strategic Employment Site Study (WMSESS), which identifies the M42 corridor as the area of highest demand for strategic industrial and commercial uses (Area A). UPdated WMSESS likely to be published before draft Plan is adopted.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Would accept, in principle, that there are no exceptional circumstances. This position may change depending on the results of the Government consultation.
Q01	Gillian Griggs [3964]		There is no clear justification for using the 2014 based household projection figures to establish Q01. The methodology produces an annual delivery rate of 885 dwellings per annum. This is double the annual rate achieved over the last 10 years and is unrealistic. If the contribution to the HMA shortfall is increased, this rate will be even higher and well above the government cap. It will be undeliverable. An exceptional circumstances case is justified having regard to the unachievable required rate and its unacceptable impact on the Green Belt setting and quality of the Borough
Q01	Gladman Developments (Mr Craig Barnes) [6041]		in order to minimise the potential effect no or delayed delivery at any allocated site would have, Gladman consider that there is a need for additional allocations to be identified.
Q01	Gladman Developments (Mr Craig Barnes) [6041]		Supports the use of the Standard Methodology for assessing Q01 however believes there is a strong case for the requirement to be uplifted above this point. HS2 and associated transport infrastructure improvements will enhance connections between the Borough and wider urban area. The UK Central Hub proposals aims to secure long term benefits to regional economy and sufficient homes should be planned for in the authority and wider HMA area to support this. Failure to plan for this could lead to affordability pressures, unsustainable commuting patterns and reduce the economic benefits which might be secured from HS2. Questions basis for the 2,000 increase above the standard methodology figure to accommodate HMA needs and why a larger figure has not been pursued. There is no discussion to the wider shortfall of which 70% declared unmet need within the HMA remains. It is clear that in order to secure a successful outcome across the HMA authorities will need to come together and adopt a memorandum of understanding to set out how the unmet need will be addressed. There are strong justifications for Solihull to accommodate a larger proportion of this unmet need, migratory links between Solihull and Birmingham are amongst strongest in HMA, Solihull will benefit significantly from improvements to the quality and frequency of public transport connections, benefitting directly from HS2. Is the location for over 100,000 jobs as well as Birmingham Airport and the NEC. The role of Solihull within the West Midlands economy will evolve with the UK Central Hub.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	<p>We agree with the adoption of the Governments Standard Methodology for assessing the Borough's housing need and the use of the 2014 based household projections.</p> <p>Where we disagree is the contribution that the Plan is currently seeking to make towards the wider Housing Market Area which is clearly insufficient. By only proposing to accommodate 2,000 homes, SMBC is falling way short of its responsibilities in addressing housing requirements across the HMA.</p> <p>Please see full representation.</p>
Q01	Greenlight Developments (Philip Rawle) [3908]		<p>PPG is clear that standard methodology does not consider impact of future government policies or changing economic circumstances, and that higher figures may be appropriate on the basis of employment/infrastructure. No evidence produced to demonstrate that housing figure is sufficient taking account of implications of employment growth at UKC Hub Area.</p> <p>DLP defers further consideration of the HMA shortfall figure (2000) to Reg19 stage, which is not consistent with NPPF, as such matters should be "dealt with rather than deferred". Given strong economic/demographic links between Birmingham and Solihull, should demonstrate consideration of higher figure.</p> <p>SHMA concludes significant need for specialist housing and care home spaces, but neither DLP or Supplementary Consultation address need.</p>
Q01	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Laurence Holmes) [6110]		<p>Agree with approach of applying the Standard Method for calculating housing need for the Plan period.</p> <p>Should note the Government seeks to review in next 18 months, which may impact housing figure.</p> <p>In order to ensure Draft Local Plan is found sound, LPA must agree on robust mechanism to secure meeting unmet need in HMA.</p> <p>Evidence for assumptions on housing supply, urban capacity including densities and windfall provision will need to kept up-to-date.</p>
Q01	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Support proposed housing distribution, review of green belt boundaries and reassessment of washed over green belt settlements. Object to lack of justification/agreement for scale of contribution to wider HMA shortfall. Insufficient deliverable sites to meet needs and more small/medium sites required.</p> <p>Contends that despite use of Standard Methodology based on 2014 household projections, there is still no signed Statement of Common Ground, (contrary to NPPF).</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Hampton Road Developments Ltd [4643]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	We do not believe that there are exceptional circumstances that would justify the Council using an alternative approach to the new standard methodology as set out. We note the Council's intention to respond to the potential additional support towards the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area ('HMA') will be dealt with at the Regulation 19 Pre-Submission stage.
Q01	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (John Pearce) [6261]	Agree approach to calculating housing need and welcome calculation on both 2014/2016 based household projections. Any additional housing requirement for wider HMA shortfall should be provided in addition to local need.
Q01	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	Do not believe there are exceptional circumstances that would justify an alternative approach, but nonetheless consider Plan has not appropriately addressed the requirement to contribute to the unmet need of the wider HMA. Concern about lack of clarity over mechanism to agree unmet need and how Plan should provide for need. Procrastination will delay preparation of other Plans significantly affecting HMA and risks stifling economic growth. Borough well placed to deliver greater proportion of unmet need. Less harmful Amber sites identified that can deliver additional 706 dwellings, including up to 340 at Blue Lake Road (ref A5).
Q01	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	we would agree that there are no exceptional circumstances for the Council to use an alternative approach. However, given the specific spatial circumstances, the Council should ensure that sufficient capacity is provided to allow for economic growth that is planned for
Q01	IM Land [3900]	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs Rachel Best) [2448]	There are exceptional circumstances that would justify an alternative approach. These are the economic growth aspirations of the Council and resultant expected job growth. The Standard Methodology minimum of 777dpa to meet local need needs to be increased to between 825 and 1,127dpa to account for economic growth aspirations and expected job growth set out in the evidence base, and based on GBSLEP aspirations. Solihull has duty to deliver a share of the unmet need from the wider HMA, ranging from 28,000 to 2021 and 80,000 to 2026

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Fiona Lee-McQueen) [6265]	<p>Agree that SM is good starting point for assessing housing need. PPG states that only a minimum.</p> <p>Two factors need to be considered at the next stage of the Local Plan:</p> <p>a) Impact of supergrowth associated with High Speed 2 (HS2), the planned investment in strategic infrastructure improvements at UK Central and elsewhere in the Borough to facilitate growth, on the housing needs</p> <p>b) Reach a more firm position in respect of the level of HMA shortfall that will be accommodated in the Borough.</p>
Q01	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	<p>Agree that SM is good starting point for assessing housing need. PPG states that only a minimum.</p> <p>Two factors need to be considered at the next stage of the Local Plan:</p> <p>a) Impact of supergrowth associated with High Speed 2 (HS2), the planned investment in strategic infrastructure improvements at UK Central and elsewhere in the Borough to facilitate growth, on the housing needs</p> <p>b) Reach a more firm position in respect of the level of HMA shortfall that will be accommodated in the Borough.</p>
Q01	IM Properties [279]	Marrons Planning (Daniel Robinson-Wells) [6202]	<p>Concern that sites have been disregarded when the overall housing requirement remains unknown. Some amber/red sites should be proposed for the Plan period and/or longer term development. Need for sufficient supply and mix to meet the requirement and provide a realistic trajectory, to provide greater flexibility than 5% given the reliance on larger allocations, and to include more smaller allocations. Lack of compelling evidence for level of windfalls proposed.</p>
Q01	Joelle Hill [4425]		<p>It might be better for the council to use the up to date method for calculating the housing requirement rather than using the 2014 method. This would see the actual requirement in the borough reduced.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Support proposed housing distribution, review of green belt boundaries and reassessment of washed over green belt settlements. Object to lack of justification/agreement for scale of contribution to wider HMA shortfall. Insufficient deliverable residential site allocations identified which comply with site selection criteria and national policy recommendations. Plan should be future proofed by allocating land for more houses than recommended by standard methodology, recognising it is a minimum starting point and need to boost house building. More small and medium sized viable sites need to be allocated. Housing Delivery Test misleading given lack of objectively assessed need in SLP2013 and DLP requirement. Requires 20% buffer and/or Action Plan. Despite use of Standard Methodology based on 2014 household projections, there is still no signed Statement of Common Ground, contrary to NPPF.
Q01	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	- Support the adoption of the Standard methodology and consider there are no exceptional circumstances to deviate from this. - Regrettable that the Council have elected not to, as yet, tackle the issue of the <u>contribution to the wider Market Housing Area</u>
Q01	Kier Living Ltd [5867]		Solihull should accommodate larger portion of Birmingham City's unmet needs than currently providing for and make more significant contribution to the West Midland Combined Authority's regional housing requirement (see WM Housing Package). Using standard methodology, Birmingham shortfall is 20,444 (37,900 in Plan) and HMA only providing 10,130 (SGS). Borough well-placed to provide for Birmingham needs and has accommodated 28% of net migration from City. Plan should accommodate 5,723 (10,612) of unmet HMA needs. WM Housing Package requires 215,000 new homes by 2031. Proportionate to standard methodology, Solihull contribution should be 7% or 15,050, so need more complex/higher than suggested.
Q01	Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]		Use of the 2014 based household projections, together with a contribution of 2,000 dwellings towards the Housing Market Assessment (HMA) shortfall, would lead to a required annual delivery rate of 885 dwellings. This is double the rate achieved over the last 10 years and is unrealistic. If the HMA shortfall contribution were to increase, this rate would be even higher and above the Government cap. It would be undeliverable. Bearing in mind also the unsuitability of the sites proposed in KDBH, the housing requirement and the HMA contribution will need to be reduced. There is justification for an alternative approach.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Agree with use of 2014-based projections and application of cap. Figure arrived at is minimum. There are clear exceptional circumstances to justify significantly higher housing figure taking account of the significant economic growth at UKC/Arden Cross and employment-led growth recommended in SGS. Response to DLP indicated Solihull needs of 20,000-24,000 dwellings over Plan period, without uplift for UKC/SGS.
Q01	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Agree with use of 2014-based projections and application of cap. Figure arrived at is minimum. There are clear exceptional circumstances to justify significantly higher housing figure taking account of the significant economic growth at UKC/Arden Cross and employment-led growth recommended in SGS. Response to DLP indicated Solihull needs of 20,000-24,000 dwellings over Plan period, without uplift for UKC/SGS.
Q01	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Agree with use of 2014-based projections and application of cap. Figure arrived at is minimum. There are clear exceptional circumstances to justify significantly higher housing figure taking account of the significant economic growth at UKC/Arden Cross and employment-led growth recommended in SGS. Response to DLP indicated Solihull needs of 20,000-24,000 dwellings over Plan period, without uplift for UKC/SGS.
Q01	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Agree with use of 2014-based projections and application of cap. Figure arrived at is minimum. There are clear exceptional circumstances to justify significantly higher housing figure taking account of the significant economic growth at UKC/Arden Cross and employment-led growth recommended in SGS. Response to DLP indicated Solihull needs of 20,000-24,000 dwellings over Plan period, without uplift for UKC/SGS.
Q01	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	See attached letter for full question response. We remain of the view that an allowance of 2,000 homes is not sound. Evidence underpinning this will have to be explained as part of the plan-making process We suspect that when properly assessed, the scale of unmet need forecast across the HMA to 2036 will be significantly higher than specified in the SGS. This in turn, will necessitate the identification and allocation of additional sites for housing development. The Council must also assess its needs over a longer term period (stretching well beyond the normal plan period)

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Landowner Winterton Farm [5795]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	We do not consider there are exceptional circumstances to deviate from standard methodology. The Council should be using the standard methodology to determine the minimum number of homes needed and the 2014 based household projections should be used for standard methodology calculations to establish the Q01. Insufficient contribution to wider HMA shortfall.
Q01	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Support distribution of housing and review of green belt boundaries. Lack of evidence that contribution to wider HMA shortfall is adequate, given increased scale of need, or of necessary Statement of Common Ground. No evidence that SGS growth options investigated, so potential capacity has not been objectively tested. Should allocate more land than minimum required for local and wider housing need, and identify a range of small/medium sized sites to ensure meet housing delivery test.
Q01	Lichfield District Council (Mr Stephen Stray) [5384]		welcome recognition of the potential need to revise the housing requirement figure in the regulation 19 publication version, however, the concern regarding failure to meet the commitments associated with cross boundary cooperation remains as it is indicated that Solihull will only be updating their position in the version that is published. Without cooperation with authorities in the Housing Market Area, it remains the case that any finalised figure has not had appropriate assessment. Need more justification for contribution to HMA shortfall to ascertain whether land supply buffer of 726 is sufficient
Q01	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Would accept, in principle, that there are no exceptional circumstances. This position may change depending on the results of the Government consultation
Q01	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Insufficient deliverable residential site allocations identified which comply with site selection criteria and national policy recommendations. Plan should be future proofed by allocating land for more houses than recommended by standard methodology, recognising it is a minimum starting point and need to boost house building. More small and medium sized viable sites need to be allocated. Housing Delivery Test misleading given lack of objectively assessed need in SLP2013 and DLP requirement. Requires 20% buffer and/or Action Plan. Despite use of Standard Methodology based on 2014 household projections, there is still no signed Statement of Common Ground, contrary to NPPF.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Mr Russell Blake [6189]		I support the opinions cited by the KDBH Neighbourhood plan reponse to this and other questions dated 12.03.19 In addition personally I believe there are exception circumstances in arriving at the housing need. Given that methodology generates rates of annual housing completion which have practically never been achieved in the Borough an alternative approach should be used
Q01	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Support proposed housing distribution, review of green belt boundaries and reassessment of washed over green belt settlements. Object to lack of justification/agreement for scale of contribution to wider HMA shortfall. Insufficient deliverable residential site allocations identified which comply with site selection criteria and national policy recommendations. Plan should be future proofed by allocating land for more houses than recommended by standard methodology, recognising it is a minimum starting point and need to boost house building. More small and medium sized viable sites need to be allocated. Housing Delivery Test misleading given lack of objectively assessed need in SLP2013 and DLP requirement. Requires 20% buffer and/or Action Plan. Despite use of Standard Methodology based on 2014 household projections, there is still no signed Statement of Common Ground, contrary to NPPF.
Q01	Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]		Housing requirement is too high/margin excessive, resulting in unachievable build rates. The unsuitability of some potential housing sites together with unattainable delivery rates means that the identified housing need/contribution to the HMA shortfall cannot be met. The housing requirement needs to be reduced. Sustainability of the proposed contribution to the HMA shortfall needs to be examined bearing in mind the principal contribution of the Green Belt in key parts of the Borough and the shortage of suitable sites.
Q01	Mr Christopher McDermott [3693]		we need to provide houses
Q01	Mr David Roberts [2570]		It is now recognised that the projected housing requirement nationally is incorrect and less than originally envisaged see the National Office Of Statistics reduction of national number reduced to 248000 from 300000. Birmingham for its part has reduced the actual number on their housing list significantly and you are not recognising this. I have discussed this at length with officers in Birmingham.
Q01	Mr David Varley [3385]		I am unable to comment on the prudent approach taken by Solihull by using the 2014 household projection figures.
Q01	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		Why are there so many homes earmarked for Solihull?

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		Paragraph 45 states that it is prudent to use the higher projections. This is wrong. It is very dangerous to release too much land as stated by Government Advisor Professor Wenban-Smith in his report of 27 Jan 2016 - "Critique of West Midlands Housing Needs Assessment" paragraphs 24/25. Over provision can never be corrected; under provision can be corrected later when needs are better defined. I look forward to the submission version of the plan and expect to see reduced numbers leading to significant sites being removed from the allocations in the Green Belt. .
Q01	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		The borough does not exist in isolation. It is part of the Birmingham conurbation and largely is providing dormitory facilities for the wider community. Plan should be more holistic looking at needs and land stock across the region, not apportioned mathematically by local authority. Warwickshire has huge reserves of land without compromising green belt and labour shortages, but transport infrastructure prohibits integration with urban centres. Additional accommodation could be provided if suitable transport integration was prioritised. This should be addressed by the WMCA.
Q01	Mr J Allen [4072]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Paul Harris) [4070]	No exceptional circumstances to deviate from the standard methodology, but this is only the minimum starting point. Ambitions to support economic growth and to deliver affordable housing are additional to the Q01 figure. Important to recognise that the standard methodology is intended to deal with housing requirements arising only within Solihull. The wider Housing Market Area is a separate issue to be planned for. Regrettable that this has not been addressed, given that a 2000 contribution to HMA shortfall is not evidence based and the figure has significant objections. Solihull should contribute 5000-6000 dwellings to the shortfall.
Q01	Mr J Kimberley [6232]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Support proposed distribution, review of green belt boundaries, use of standard methodology, but concerned at lack of justification/agreement for contribution to wider HMA shortfall. Insufficient deliverable sites allocated to meet needs. Some green/allocated sites have significant questions over deliverability and compliance with national policies/sustainability considerations, meaning some 1,060 dwellings may not be delivered.
Q01	Mr Ken Bridgwater [5912]		Hockley Heath can not support further development due to lack of services ie. shops and there is no medical facilities. Localised flooding is already causing problems within the village. We need to protect the natural environment. There is a high bird population (owls, woodpeckers, sparrows, buzzards, blue tits) plus oak trees which provide essential oxygen and help diffuse heavy ground moisture.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		Cannot think of any reason to support special circumstances being required.
Q01	Mr M Trentham [2114]		No.
Q01	Mr Mark Bruckshaw [3743]		Its important new property is developed, but Solihull should take its share as an authority. There are too many houses proposed in this area (Shirley address)
Q01	Mr N Walters [2802]		There is no fomally recognised definition of Affordable housing. SMBC have guidance making developers provide affordable housing on most new sites, but these homes are usually targeted towards Housing Associations and council housing waiting lists, there is no consideration towards provision of standard family housing for young families who are above the threshold criteria for HA affordable housing or entry onto council housing lists, they are a forgotten and under represented cohort that get overlooked.
Q01	Mr Steve Coathup [6078]		I believe there are exceptional circumstances that should inform Solihull's approach to its plan. These are specifically: a) the agreement made with Birmingham to provide 2000 dwellings of their shortfall identified in their 2018 Gtr Birmingham growth study up to 2033. In addition, the assumptions within this document assume a density within Solihull of 36dph which is the highest density of any rural areas surrounding Birmingham, the lowest being 15-20.
Q01	Mr Trevor Vaisey [5661]		Why is there a need for so many houses in the Shirley area ?
Q01	Mr William Cairns [3206]		The apparent fudge on the required housing numbers clearly shows that SMBC are running scared of demands that will be placed on them from the HMA. Failure to use the latest housing forecast data reveals a state of mind commensurate with fear of being run over by developers again in the courts and the demands of neighbouring councils in the HMA. I am concerned about the uncertainty and anxiety that the preliminary estimates have introduced into the process of commenting on the draft plan given that revision is all but certain to occur.
Q01	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Support proposed distribution, review of green belt boundaries, use of standard methodology, but concerned at lack of justification/agreement for contribution to wider HMA shortfall. Insufficient deliverable sites allocated to meet needs. Some green/allocated sites have significant questions over deliverability and compliance with national policies/sustainability considerations, meaning some 1,060 dwellings may not be delivered.
Q01	Mrs A Kidson [6259]		Other parts of the borough need to make a contribution towards the housing targets set by government.
Q01	Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]		Local housing may be needed but NOT at the detriment of the local people.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		It is not clear to me that environmental and pollution impacts have truly been taken into consideration in the methodology. In many cases farm land is being used/seized. What limited farm land we had created a necessary boundary between blocks of development. There is no vision for a green sustainable Solihull.
Q01	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		There are areas of Solihull which are very badly congested and polluted. There are circumstances where the Council should be intervening in building plans to alleviate congestion and not add to already existing problems. Traffic congestion is a huge problem in the area.
Q01	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Housing should be allocated fairly
Q01	Mrs Diane Thornton [3107]		I believe the council has based it's calculation on the 2014 Office of National Statistics figures and there is a clear case that the 2016 figures could be used which shows a lower calculation. With the current proposals the council would need to build 885 homes per year, a target that has never been obtained.
Q01	Mrs E Hedley [3516]		There is no justification for using the 2014 based household projections to establish Q01. This methodology produces an annual delivery rate of 885 dwellings per annum. This is double the annual rate achieved over the last 10 years and is unrealistic. If the contribution to the HMA shortfall is increased this rate will be even higher and well above the government cap. It will be undeliverable. An exceptional circumstances case is justified having regard to the unachievable required rate and its unacceptable impact on the Green Belt setting and quality of the Borough. This requirement should be capped.
Q01	Mrs Fiona Somerville [5786]		This would be open to a variety of interpretations by Planning Officers and we are well aware of the problems caused by Planning Officers interpreting policies to justify their recommendations.
Q01	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		Acknowledged that SM imposed at national level. Council should continue to press on government as it has potentially significant consequences for loss of highly performing Green Belt. Annual dwelling rate of 885dpa is above the highest rate ever achieved by the Council except 2005, double average delivery rate of last 10 years, and above the 40% cap. 2016 based household projections of 550dpa, and in GL Hearn study, is more realistic and deliverable. Council can use exceptional circumstances to justify using the 2016 household projections under Para. 60 of the NPPF.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		I understand that Solihull is above average for air quality standards. I also think too much development is happening at once in the Shirley area of the borough. No extra provision of being made for infrastructure-eg doctors and train station parking capacity/as well as being able to get on an actual train (I already struggle with both issues at Whitlocks End) I am also concerned about flooding as we already have major issues in Cheswick Green
Q01	Mrs Wendy Murphy [5694]		Why are there so many homes proposed for Shirley?
Q01	NaCSBA (Mrs Sally Tagg) [6115]		The document does not make a single reference to custom or self build or those wishing to build their own homes. SMBC should publish the level of demand for self build as demonstrated through the self build register. This will inform the Local Plan review to ensure sufficient plots are available. Ascertain a target for self build provision for the Borough. A policy promoting self build must be included in the emerging plan to comply with the NPPF, the Housing and Planning Act, and the Right to build. In line with paragraph 119 of the NPPF allocate sites in the plan to meet the needs of those wishing to self build. Washed over area of green belt should not be removed however a policy should be included stating Custom, self build, starter and affordable homes will be considered acceptable as part of limited infill within existing ribbon developments within the Green Belt where it is demonstrated that they do not have an adverse impact upon the openness and integrity of the wider Green Belt.
Q01	Nick Tickner [5514]		It should be noted that certain areas have provided new housing to a much greater extent over the past 15-20 years than others. Dickens Heath has probably provided the bulk of Solihull's new houses for years, and to expect it to absorb another 350 houses as proposed (Site 4 West) is overburdening the already strained infrastructure
Q01	Paul J Dufrane [4410]		I believe the council has based its calculation on the 2014 Office of National Statistics figures and there is a clear case that the 2016 figures could be used.
Q01	Pauline Daniels [3674]		Why are there so many homes proposed near Shirley?
Q01	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		No exceptional circumstances to justify the Council using an alternative approach to the Government's standard methodology. This figure is only the minimum starting point. Any ambitions to support economic growth, to deliver affordable housing and to meet unmet housing needs from elsewhere are additional to the Q01 figure. No clear justification for 2,000 dwellings as the chosen figure for Solihull's contribution to the HMA shortfall

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		The global promotion of UK Central Hub will generate migration demand likely to be different to the historical demand. Thus the migration trends arising from the UK Central Hub initiative are wholly different to the norm represented by the 2014 based housing projections. Analysis of a parallel project centred on Ebbsfleet on the HS1 route indicates extraneous migration is likely to be much higher than historical migration. Exceptional circumstances are considered to prevail as a result of the UK Central Hub, which need to be taken into account in the overall housing requirement.
Q01	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Given the findings of the Employment Land Review (2017), we query whether there is adequate evidence regarding employment needs to answer this question. There is scope for an uplift in the housing requirement as a result of the HS2-related growth, as well as the potential to capitalise on the clear need for wider than local employment growth identified through evidence such as the 2015 West Midlands Strategic Employment Site Study (WMSESS), which identifies the M42 corridor as the area of highest demand for strategic industrial and commercial uses (Area A). The forthcoming new WMSESS is likely to be published before the draft Plan is adopted. On top of Birmingham's unmet housing needs, the potential for higher housing numbers as a result of these points is something we consider could be an exceptional circumstance to justify an uplift beyond the standard method minimum (which we currently calculate to be 777 dwellings per annum).
Q01	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Given the findings of the Employment Land Review (2017), we query whether there is adequate evidence regarding employment needs to answer this question. There is scope for an uplift in the housing requirement as a result of the HS2-related growth, as well as the potential to capitalise on the clear need for wider than local employment growth identified through evidence such as the 2015 West Midlands Strategic Employment Site Study (WMSESS), which identifies the M42 corridor as the area of highest demand for strategic industrial and commercial uses (Area A). The forthcoming new WMSESS is likely to be published before the draft Plan is adopted. On top of Birmingham's unmet housing needs, the potential for higher housing numbers as a result of these points is something we consider could be an exceptional circumstance to justify an uplift beyond the standard method minimum (which we currently calculate to be 777 dwellings per annum).

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Given the findings of the Employment Land Review (2017), we query whether there is adequate evidence regarding employment needs to answer this question. There is scope for an uplift in the housing requirement as a result of the HS2-related growth, as well as the potential to capitalise on the clear need for wider than local employment growth identified through evidence such as the 2015 West Midlands Strategic Employment Site Study (WMSESS), which identifies the M42 corridor as the area of highest demand for strategic industrial and commercial uses (Area A). The forthcoming new WMSESS is likely to be published before the draft Plan is adopted. On top of Birmingham's unmet housing needs, the potential for higher housing numbers as a result of these points is something we consider could be an exceptional circumstance to justify an uplift beyond the standard method minimum (which we currently calculate to be 777 dwellings per annum).
Q01	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Given the findings of the Employment Land Review (2017), we query whether there is adequate evidence regarding employment needs to answer this question. There is scope for an uplift in the housing requirement as a result of the HS2-related growth, as well as the potential to capitalise on the clear need for wider than local employment growth identified through evidence such as the 2015 West Midlands Strategic Employment Site Study (WMSESS), which identifies the M42 corridor as the area of highest demand for strategic industrial and commercial uses (Area A). The forthcoming new WMSESS is likely to be published before the draft Plan is adopted. On top of Birmingham's unmet housing needs, the potential for higher housing numbers as a result of these points is something we consider could be an exceptional circumstance to justify an uplift beyond the standard method minimum (which we currently calculate to be 777 dwellings per annum).

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Given the findings of the Employment Land Review (2017), we consider that the Council have not produced the necessary evidence regarding employment needs to answer this question. There is scope for an uplift in the housing requirement as a result of the HS2-related growth, as well as the potential to capitalise on the clear need for wider than local employment growth identified through evidence such as the 2015 West Midlands Strategic Employment Site Study (WMSESS), which identifies the M42 corridor as the area of highest demand for strategic industrial and commercial uses (Area A). The forthcoming new WMSESS is likely to be published before the draft Plan is adopted. In addition to Birmingham's unmet housing needs, the potential for higher housing numbers as a result of these points is something we consider could be an exceptional circumstance to justify an uplift beyond the standard method minimum (which we currently calculate to be 777 dwellings per annum). Based on what we know regarding the issues with the Council's Employment Land Review, more employment land is required. A further increase in housing need (for instance in helping to meet Birmingham's unmet housing need) would require a further increase in employment land to ensure growth is balanced.</p> <p>The Council's approach to employment is inadequate as currently proposed, and further housing growth over and above this will require a further increase in employment land to ensure growth is balanced. Land at Park Lane Balsall Common is well placed to meet this employment land need. The site presents an opportunity to capitalise on HS2-related development and provide a sustainably located, well enclosed employment site which can serve the needs of the Balsall Common as it grows through the Plan period. The site will be used as a compound during the construction of HS2 and therefore cannot come forward until completion of this part of the route and/or it is released earlier as it is no longer needed by HS2. Employment land would therefore be delivered post-2025/6.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Given the findings of the Employment Land Review (2017), we query whether there is adequate evidence regarding employment needs to answer this question. There is scope for an uplift in the housing requirement as a result of the HS2-related growth, as well as the potential to capitalise on the clear need for wider than local employment growth identified through evidence such as the 2015 West Midlands Strategic Employment Site Study (WMSESS), which identifies the M42 corridor as the area of highest demand for strategic industrial and commercial uses (Area A). The forthcoming new WMSESS is likely to be published before the draft Plan is adopted. On top of Birmingham's unmet housing need the potential for higher housing numbers as a result of these points is something we consider could be an exceptional circumstance to justify an uplift beyond the standard method minimum (which we currently calculate to be 777 dwellings per annum).
Q01	Real Christmas Trees Ltd [3629]	Twelve Twenty One Planning Services (Mr Charles Robinson) [6103]	It is considered that the Council has still not included sufficient houses to cater for the wider Housing Market Area requirements. It is considered that the provision for the shortfall that is occurring in the wider HMA should be increased to at least 4000 dwellings over the period 2018 - 2035.
Q01	Redditch Borough Council (Ruth Bamford) [3925]		Concerns remain over justification for commitment to test potential for 2,000 dwellings towards wider HMA needs. This level does not adequately respond to HMA shortfall, given Solihull's relationship with Birmingham. Figure not agreed by HMA authorities and is not a firm basis for development strategy and site allocations. This is a fundamental issue that will need to be addressed in Statement of Common Ground. Addressing this at Submission stage is too late in process as this will have significant implications for the development strategy, and knock on effects for neighbouring areas. Urge progression of Statement of Common Ground.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		<p>The methodology imposed at national level and using the 2014 based figures probably produces a higher figure than the latest projections (2016) indicate are necessary. The Council are yet to reach agreement with adjoining Councils in terms its contribution to the HMA shortfall, and unless the Council make additional provision in their Local Plan it is likely that the Council will not be able to fulfil its duty to cooperate. More housing land may need to be allocated in the green belt. The proposed rate of delivery is far above the highest that has been achieved in Borough and unlikely this can be sustained. The 2016 based projection from GL Hearn is more realistic. It is likely that some of the sites will not be capable of delivery because of ownership and infrastructure issues. The Council hasn't allocated smaller sites and is relying on a handful of larger sites which are unlikely to deliver the housing numbers. Failed to consider wider components of growth, omitting areas of employment such as in Balsall Common, Knowle and Dickens Heath. No provision is made to encourage employment sustainability.</p>
Q01	Richard Lloyd [2616]		<p>Yes. The population is of above average age, therefore the standard method artificially inflates the rate of household formation. In addition, the high proportion of retired people with substantial resources creates distortion in the affordability ratio. A more accurate assessment of local need could be based on actual demographics based on records of births, marriages, and deaths</p>
Q01	Richborough Estates [3816]	Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]	<p>Additional housing allocations required to meet housing needs, as there will be circumstances where appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than standard method indicates. The 2,000 additional dwellings contribution toward meeting wider needs of HMA, has yet to be determined as appropriate and may well increase. The WMCA agreement to increase housing by 2030-2031 is above the standard methodology level and it is unclear how emerging DLP responds to this requirement. HS2 is likely to increase number of homes needed locally, and the minimum housing provision does not take into account the future impact of HS2.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Richborough Estates [3816]	Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]	Recognise Standard Methodology is appropriate starting point for assessing Q01s figure. PPG states this is only a minimum and circumstances may occur where this is higher. Yet to be formally determined if 2,000 contribution to HMA is appropriate. Unclear how LPR responds to WMCA Mayoral commitment to 215K homes by 2031. SM does not take into account growth around HS2 and its impact on local housing market and demand for new homes for commuters. All of above should be robustly considered to determine whether LHN should be higher.
Q01	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Would accept, in principle, that there are no exceptional circumstances. This position may change depending on the results of the Government consultation. Whilst the document does not seek comments about unmet need, the close economic and geographical relationships between Solihull and Birmingham it is inevitable that a greater share of the unmet need from BCC should be accommodated within Solihull.
Q01	Schools of King Edward VI in Birmingham [3520]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Miles Drew) [3519]	Whilst our Client is of the view that SMBC has applied the Standard Method in accordance with the NPPF, the housing target for the Borough that is ultimately proposed at Pre-Submission stage must include: i) an evidenced, justified contribution to the unmet needs arising within the HMA; and ii) an allowance for the safeguarded land so that Green Belt boundaries can endure beyond the plan period in accordance with the NPPF.
Q01	Simon Taylor [4550]		- Fundamental flaws in Q01 methodology, most significantly use of affordability ratios and targeting a ratio of 4 - Question the relevance of the ratio, given that earnings are derived from outside of Solihull - LHN based on house prices
Q01	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		support the council using the standard methodology
Q01	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	Within the document that has been issued for consultation, there appears to be no justification for moving away from the standard methodology. SMBC needs to be confident that there is sufficient supply of sites to meet both the Borough's housing need and the wider HMA shortfall contribution.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	St Philips Ltd [6228]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Kate Green) [6227]	<p>St Philips agrees with the approach of applying the Standard Method for calculating housing need for the Plan period, but notes that the calculation provides a minimum figure and a starting point for the preparation of the Local Plan. Although not consulted on, St Philips does not consider the 2,000 contribution is sound.</p> <p>In terms of housing supply: Council should provide full schedule of sites in the housing supply and proposed trajectory, inc. permissions. Do not consider there is sufficient evidence for inclusion of BLR sites in the supply assumptions. Need further evidence to justify continued inclusion of SLP sites. More justification required for UKCHub and NEC figures. Question deliverability of windfall sites at 150dpa over plan period. Should provide more information on 1ha sites in accordance with NPPF.</p>
Q01	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	<p>St Philips do not believe there are exceptional circumstances that would justify the Council using an alternative approach, but nonetheless consider the Council have not appropriately addressed the requirement to contribute to the unmet need of the wider HMA. Use of standard methodology and 2014-based projections welcomed. Evidence of lack of agreement across HMA authorities, with NWBC raising concerns. Lack of clarity over mechanism to agree distribution and delivery of shortfall. Solihull well placed to deliver greater proportion, procrastination will result in unmet housing needs, stifle economic growth, and failure to include will mean Plan unsound.</p>
Q01	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	<p>No exceptional circumstances to deviate from the standard methodology as that is a requirement in the NPPF. The Council should be using the standard methodology to determine the minimum number of homes needed and the 2014 based household projections should be used for standard methodology calculations to establish the Q01 ('LHN') figure.</p> <p>The figure of 109% deems that no action is required. However, the MHCLG is committed to boosting the supply of housing and although the housing delivery test score requires no action we consider that assessed need housing numbers should be seen as minima.</p>
Q01	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Would accept, in principle, that there are no exceptional circumstances. This position may change depending on the results of the Government consultation.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		Stratford-on-Avon District Council is supportive of Solihull's conclusion that the standard methodology should be used. Should SMBC wish to use an alternative methodology, careful consideration would need to be given to the potential wider and possibly consequential implications on other authorities within the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area.
Q01	Summix (FHS) Developments Ltd [4455]	Framptons Planning (Mr Greg Mitchell) [2685]	<p>Consideration of HMA shortfall at Regulation 19 stage inappropriate/unlawful as may require revised strategy or propose additional green belt releases, which ought to require further Regulation 18 consultation. Otherwise this would be a completely new strategy resulting in a plan that has not been previously consulted upon. This approach would lead to a challenge to the lawfulness of the process and possible intervention by the Secretary of State. Any preferred options that may derive from a revised HMA contribution should be subject to consultation prior to stage 3 submission as described in the SCI and plan making regulations.</p> <p>Regulations make a distinction between Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 in order to aid sound plan making and to ensure that there is an appropriate opportunity for all those concerned to contribute to it and influence it.</p> <p>Insufficient and unjustified contribution to wider HMA shortfall which reasonably should be more significant than 3,790 dwellings proposed by North Warwickshire BC, given Solihull's proximity to Birmingham and public transport links. Suggest 6,500 (17% of shortfall). Site 313 Fulford Hall Farm, Tidbury Green could make significant contribution to part of this shortfall, due to sustainable location as demonstrated by Mobility and Transport Strategy.</p>
Q01	Taylor Wimpey [579]	Lichfields (Zoe Simmonds) [5575]	<p>Agree broad approach taken to identify OAN for the Borough and assessments undertaken of the alternatives for delivering new homes on brownfield land. Agree that the housing need cannot be achieved from brownfield land alone.</p> <p>Note the assessment of the Green Belt in the Borough to identify those areas/sites which do not perform as strongly in terms of the functions of the Green Belt.</p> <p>In line with the guidance in paragraphs 136 and 137 of the NPPF, it is agreed that there are exceptional circumstances to alter the Green Belt boundaries in order to allow for further housing growth.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Terra Strategic [5698]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	<p>We agree with the adoption of the Governments Standard Methodology for assessing the Borough's housing need and the use of the 2014 based household projections.</p> <p>Where we disagree is the contribution that the Plan is currently seeking to make towards the wider Housing Market Area which is clearly insufficient.</p> <p>By only proposing to accommodate 2,000 homes, SMBC is falling way short of its responsibilities in addressing housing requirements across the HMA.</p> <p>Please see full representation.</p>
Q01	Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]		<p>Birmingham Council is still dragging its feet in clearing up the large amounts of Brownfield sites that are still available. I would ask that Solihull Council continue to press Birmingham Council to get its act together and clear up the Brownfield sites before anymore of Solihull green belt is sacrificed. Brown field sites in Birmingham should be developed first before we lose our precious urbs in rure.</p>
Q01	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		<p>no exceptional circumstances to justify the Council using an alternative approach to the Government's standard methodology.</p> <p>This figure is only the minimum starting point. Any ambitions to support economic growth, to deliver affordable housing and to meet unmet housing needs from elsewhere are additional to the Q01 figure.</p> <p>No clear justification for 2,000 dwellings as the chosen figure for Solihull's contribution to the HMA shortfall. The HBF will submit representations on the proposed overall housing requirement figure in response to the pre-submission Local Plan consultation.</p>
Q01	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		<p>Supply of new homes is governed by demand and as the past average annual rate achieved over the last 10 years is half the suggested requirement, it is argued the proposed requirement rate is completely unrealistic.</p> <p>Any later changes in the 2020 projections will have an impact on future building rates but if it is less, then this raises the question of whether there is a need to demonstrate such land availability now. The overall land availability should be provided over a much longer term than this local plan suggests.</p>
Q01	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Would accept, in principle, that there are no exceptional circumstances. This position may change depending on the results of the Government consultation.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q01	Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss Charlotte Kirby) [2531]		SMBC should press Government on use of latest projections to reduce unnecessary loss of highly performing green belt. Local need plus HMA contribution is above highest level achieved in Borough and double average, and above cap that would apply if solely local need. Inconceivable that this rate can be delivered, or that industry could build even if permissions granted. Using 2016 projection would produce more realistic figure and can be justified as exceptional circumstances.
Q01	Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council (Mike Smith) [2378]		The Black Country are disappointed that your supplementary consultation statement does not appear to have considered the full implications of the GL Hearn Study and taken the opportunity to test the findings with regards to the growth scenarios within the study. Would like to seek clarity as to whether the new 'call for sites' sites, which has been published as part of the consultation, will be an additional allocation to the 2,000 dwellings. Solihull has a strong functional relationship with the Great Birmingham/Black Country HMA. Current work / evidence shows the Black Country cannot accommodate all of its needs within its urban area leading to a shortfall in the region of 22,000 dwellings and 300ha of employment land. We would expect Solihull to undertake work to establish whether you can increase the contribution. Seek assurances that the full implications of the call for sites and the GL Hearn Study have been fully tested and justified. If this exercise results in increases in the housing numbers which can be accommodated within Solihull and/or a change in the overall Strategy, than there may be a need to include a further consultation stage prior to Publication.
Q01	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	No clear justification for taking an alternative approach to the standard methodology. Using 2014 household projections proposed by the methodology the minimum annual housing figure of 767 omitting any contribution to the HMA shortfall is well in excess of the OAN for the Borough of 689 identified in the SHMA. Consultation does not seek to revise contribution SMBC is making towards shortfall in housing market area. Para 27 acknowledges that there is no clear justification why the figure of 2,000 was chosen and there is an opportunity to make a greater contribution. We support this, in that there ia an underestimation in the contribution that the Borough could make towards meeting the unmet needs of the HMA. Essential to acknowledge that Q01s figure is a minimum and a starting point for SMBC to identify the full housing needs that can be met within the Borough. Should be a comprehensive review of SMBC contribution to meeting the HMA shortfall.
Site Selection Methodology			

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Albanwise Ltd [6247]	Barton Willmore (Mr Daniel G Wilson) [5480]	- Supportive of first step in Q02 - SHELAA Site 125 scores favourably and agree with appraisal - Deem that SHELAA Site 125 should be specifically allocated for minimum 20 dwellings
Q02	Amber REI Ltd [6250]	Pegasus Group (David Onions) [6248]	The Amber sites are not identified as having any particular purpose and the whole concept of Amber sites is considered to be flawed. Key weakness in the approach is the reference to the scoring of Green Belt purposes. the Site Hierarchy Criteria has artificially moderated these scores, increasing the scoring base to 5 for lower performing Green Belt sites, condensing moderately performing sites to just 6 or 7, and increasing the range for higher performing sites to 8 or more
Q02	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		The methodology does not consider the cumulative impact of sites assessed as appropriate. A better approach would be to develop a strategic plan taking into account the locations best suited for new residents/infrastructure. Should not be driven by 'cherry picking' most desirable sites to achieve numbers but from a strategic settlement expansion plan. In considering this 'settlement first' approach, the proposal to amend the green belt boundary to the east (paragraph 97) would support retention of the existing green belt boundary to the south-west of Balsall Common and negate sprawl.
Q02	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Step 2 refinement is contrary to NPPF. Not appropriate to introduce physical boundaries in otherwise open green belt areas. Methodology should set out preferred criteria for defining clear defensible boundaries. Some red sites ruled out due to lack of defensible boundaries, whilst some sites rated green have caveat that physical boundaries will be created. Methodology not consistently and logically applied across all sites. Absence of evidence eg more detailed studies following Strategic Growth Study/Landscape Character Assessment Contend that despite use of Standard Methodology based on 2014 household projections, there is still no signed Statement of Common Ground, (contrary to NPPF),

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		<p>Seriously flawed and fails to meet NPPF requirements.</p> <p>Green belt analysis inadequate as assesses sites individually rather than cumulative impact, fails to consider loss of amenity/accessibility, takes no account of wider pressures that should be included in cumulative harm analysis, such as HS2, and gives precedence to greenfield sites that add to openness whilst ignoring sites not connected to open green belt.</p> <p>Takes no account of potential housing productivity of sites eg Site 3 where area of high ecological value/setting of listed building reduces capacity from green belt deletion. Ignores NPPF requirement for proportion of housing to be met on sites less than 1 hectare.</p> <p>Fails to give sufficient weight to effective public transport as demonstrated by frequency of services and car usage, or to costs of improvements. Balsall Common has high car dependency and less effective public transport than Dorridge, which has lower/zero housing target. No highway assessment or analysis of by-pass options, particularly western option which could serve JLR facility. Fails to consider where best location for affordable housing in Borough.</p> <p>Takes no account of house prices as indicator of unmet demand despite inclusion in national methodology.</p> <p>Should include capacity of centres to meet increased demand.</p>
Q02	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		<p>While the methodology purports to be objective, the application is subjective and inconsistent.</p> <p>As the number of dwellings is open to revision it is difficult to make a valued judgement on where houses should be built.</p>
Q02	Birmingham City Council (Mr Martin Dando) [5352]		<p>Birmingham City Council has no specific comments on the Q02 itself. However, it is not clear whether the assessment of the 70+ additional 'call for sites' submissions since the Draft Plan stage has contributed positively to the overall land supply already identified in the Q01 section of the document. If so, this would provide some additional capacity on top of the 2,000 additional homes already identified to meet the HMA shortfall.</p>
Q02	Bloor Homes [6243]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	<p>Object to the scoring of site 192has received in the Site Assessment document .</p> <p>Do not support the Step 2 'refining criteria' and the lack of clarity of how sites have been assessed against the factor listed in the table.</p> <p>Sites have been scored inconsistently, when they are in close proximity to each other.</p> <p>Site specific benefits have not been considered.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Catesby Estates Limited [3038]	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Approach agreed in principle as it focusses new development in and around existing settlements. Long established that green belt land will be required and that housing need constitutes exceptional circumstances. Requirement to consider all reasonable options before green belt met through Brownfield Land Register, Call for Sites exercises and spatial strategy. Methodology accords with NPPF.
Q02	Christine Street [4315]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Numerous sports fields on site, it is not in the public interest to build on these and reduce sporting facilities. - The infrastructure is already unable to cope with traffic and parking in the area - insufficient spaces already at Whitlocks End and at the shops in Dickens Heath. - The muntjac deer are protected in the UK under the 1991 Deer Act and the building of houses where they are seen daily (rear of Old Yardleians) will kill them. - The fields currently already flood every Winter and whenever there is heavy rainfall
Q02	Christopher Fellows [6118]		<p>Concerns about consistency of application of methodology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - difficult to see how some sites included as green in Step 2, when identified as priority 5 or above in Step 1, and Sustainability Appraisal identifies more negative than positive effects. - some sites are indicated as having no defensible boundary, when these do have clearly marked boundaries. Other sites have been proposed providing suitable boundaries can be provided. - some sites excluded because they are isolated, whereas others included because they could become attached to larger parcels of land. <p>Examples provided in response to questions 6-9, 38, 39 and 44.</p>
Q02	Councillor D Bell [2235]		I do not agree if Balsall Common station is counted as equal to Dorridge.
Q02	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>Subjectivity of methodology is a weakness: Ability to judge performance of green belt requires intimate knowledge of Borough.</p> <p>Negative feedback loop where lack of concentrations of people using alternative travel modes, public transport options limited, with little expansion and cuts in services.</p> <p>Measure success by results produced. Where settlements designed with private car in mind, issues are compounded eg Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Need to focus on future growth corridors rather than urban extensions which create car dependency indicates potential weaknesses in the methodology. Extent of growth in Blythe draws into question the functioning of the methodology that is</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	I agree with the methodology adopted for the site selection process: it is objective, logical and based on planning merit. It is notable, however, that the refinement of each site is based on a more subjective assessment of each site. It is reasonable to expect the promoters of each site to provide sufficient evidence on which the refinement should be based. It may not be possible to determine the relative value of those submissions against each other in an objective manner.
Q02	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>no, because there are significant inconsistencies in the application of the methodology which undermine the integrity of the whole site selection process. The analysis of sustainability does not meet the standards as set out in the NPPF2 Para. 3.32.</p> <p>The Council should consider reviewing their Sustainability Appraisal in line with the Government's sustainability scorecard. When applied to Site 4 at Dickens Heath, this site only scored a 30% sustainability rating which puts it in the 'red' not 'green' category. There are other sites that are inconsistent with Option G of the Spatial Strategy.</p> <p>It is not possible to understand how some of the sites fall into the green category. If an updated sustainability scoring was used the results on site selection would be different. Without this, the credibility and robustness of the process is undermined. It is also noted that the assessment excludes a number of smaller sites from the Sustainability Appraisal. The Plan's strategy continues to focus only on large scale Green Belt releases. This is not consistent with government advice in the NPPF that a mix of sites should be encouraged. Many of the small sites which have not been accepted as allocations in the Plan need to be reassessed to see if they could contribute to housing growth in a more sensitive way which has less overall impact on the Green Belt and on local character, and whether they are more readily deliverable.</p>
Q02	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>Significant inconsistencies in application of Q02.</p> <p>Sustainability analysis does not meet NPPF criteria, in Para. 3.32.</p> <p>Assessment excludes some of smaller sites from the sustainability appraisal. Smaller sites need to be reconsidered that have not been allocated as they could provide more sensitive development.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	David Knowles [3742]		<p>Account should be taken of the impact on Infrastructure in the initial identification - sites should be preferred only if they can be delivered with minimal/no impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>As the M42 already reduces the quality of sites close to it, then sites closer to the Motorway should be preferred over high quality Green Belt further away from the Motorway.</p> <p>UK Central is effectively a new settlement area and so should be considered as higher priority as it does not impact on existing residential areas.</p>
Q02	David Sharpe [4444]		<p>I think the methodology is lacking as there is no reference to the assessment of infrastructure needs, road improvements, traffic issues etc. in the assessment of sites. Infrastructure improvements needed for some sites may be significant, and have themselves land issues, It is not sufficient for the infrastructure improvement needs to be ignored at this stage and left for later assessment when sites may already be on the 'most suitable' list. Infrastructure needs, road improvements, traffic issues should be dealt with and identified upfront when selecting sites as potential sites to take forward.</p>
Q02	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	<p>We strongly object to the way in which SHELAA Site 209 has been assessed in the site selection process for the reasons set out below - and on that basis, object to the inconsistent application of the methodology.</p> <p>SHELAA Site 209 should be Priority 5 (yellow) as it is accessible in a lower scoring Green Belt location.</p> <p>Site 209 scores lower in GB terms than proposed allocation Site 4.</p> <p>Site has existing strong defensible Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>Would provide significant amenity open space above requirements.</p> <p>Medium/High Accessibility location.</p> <p>Site therefore would accord with the Spatial Strategy in DLP 2016.</p> <p>SHLEAA scoring should be amended as contaminated land issues can be overcome. N.B. TPOs would be unaffected.</p>
Q02	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	<p>We strongly object to the way in which Site 426 has been assessed in the site selection process for the reasons which are set out in the attached letter - and on that basis, object to the inconsistent application of the methodology</p>
Q02	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		<p>we agree with the council's Q02.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Dr Paul Rylah [5503]		I object to the methodology in so far as , from the onset, it has discounted the most obvious place to develop, that being the so-called Solihull gap, bordering and south of the M42, between junctions 4 and 5. It is the area that will create the least traffic congestion for existing communities, is significantly larger than the total area required for development, and hence can easily be developed while still maintaining a "gap". A methodology that omits the serious consideration of this area must be deeply flawed.
Q02	Duchy Homes Ltd [6036]	Barton Willmore Planning (Miss Hiteshree Kundalia) [6035]	Whilst we broadly agree with the methodology, we raise issue with the way this has been applied inconsistently across the borough
Q02	Edward Fraser [4138]		- Why are there so many homes being allocated to the Shirley area? - Green sites in the rest of the borough are not taking their fair share.
Q02	Gemma Welch [4413]		Objection to housing in Blythe/Shirley: - Why are there so many homes near Shirley? Shirley is already pressured an any additional housing would add further strains on the infrastructure. - There are alternative development opportunities which could be explored in Solihull, such as Knowle, Dorridge, Blythe Valley - These areas aren't as heavily polluted
Q02	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Basic elements of the Methodology acceptable and workable. Other elements are flawed and over complicated. Non-compliant with Government policy on strong defensible Green Belt boundaries as no reference to creating boundaries in NPPF. Lack of consistency, particularly when comparing sites in the same location. Site assessments incomplete in some instances. Flawed judgements or lack of sound reasons why some sites allocated/rejected /de-allocated. No advantage in creating yellow, blue and subsequently amber sites. This is unnecessary and adds to confusion and complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them as proposed allocations.
Q02	Gillian Griggs [3964]		There are significant flaws in both the methodology and its application. The site selection process must be in the context of the overall housing need and Spatial Strategy, neither of which have been updated for this consultation and should be in the light of new evidence. In testing the appropriateness of sites, consideration must be given to the impact of new development on the physical, economic and social infrastructure of the settlement and on its character and distinctiveness. The methodology does not do so. There are also significant variations in the scoring assessments of sites which require justification.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Gladman Developments (Mr Craig Barnes) [6041]		Gladman agrees with the Council that the Standard Method represents the most appropriate approach to defining the minimum housing needs of the authority
Q02	Gladman Developments (Mr Craig Barnes) [6041]		<p>In setting out the sources of housing supply the 10% deduction made towards sites which have not yet commenced but benefit from planning consent, sites identified within the SHLAA and sites identified on the Brownfield Register is welcomed to account for non / under delivery. Council should provide evidence on windfall delivery in order to clearly demonstrate that the 2,250 dwelling windfall allowance made by the Local Plan Review is justified and realistic. The Council should review its existing allocations before rolling forward the allocation of these sites through the Local Plan Review as these were first identified in the Core Strategy which was adopted 5 years ago and have still not come forward. The allocation of a site within a development plan is not on its own enough evidence to demonstrate reasonable prospect. Is concerned that there is insufficient flexibility provided within the supply to ensure full and consistent delivery of the housing requirement. The absence of a detailed housing trajectory within the Local Plan means that it is difficult to provide any comments on the deliverability of the housing requirement. It is unclear what assumptions the Council is making in terms of the lead-in time and build out rate for each of the sites identified within the supply. There is a need for the level of flexibility within the supply to be increased to at least 20%.</p> <p>Agree in principle with the two step site selection process which applies a sequential preference towards non green belt sources of supply. However considers that step 1 and step 2 assessments should be applied to all sites which do not score red. Whilst national planning policy sets out that Green Belt land is to be considered sequentially, this should not be at the cost of other sustainability factors, site suitability and deliverability. Does not object in principle to any allocation shortlisted by the Council but considers that the amount of allocations will need to substantially increase.</p> <p>Considers that the Council should consider the identification of safeguarded land through the Local Plan review. The benefit of Safeguarded Land being to ensure the longevity and permanence of the Green Belt, whilst providing flexibility for future needs to be accommodated if necessary.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	<p>We welcome the fact that some of the omission sites have been recognised as having less harm than others and are being reconsidered as 'Amber sites'.</p> <p>We do however maintain a fundamental concern over the Q02 because Step 1 of the process is reliant on a flawed Green Belt Assessment report which has errors in relation to our client's site at Golden End which need to be rectified. See later response to Question 38 for our representation on this matter.</p>
Q02	Grove Road Residents [6249]	Pegasus Group (David Onions) [6248]	<p>The methodology utilised in the site selection process has not been applied consistently and robustly across all of the sites that have been put forward. The Council's approach has significantly underscored the Green Belt and landscape significance of site 9.</p> <p>There is failure to distinguish between particular areas of the site which are more important in Green Belt and landscape terms than others.</p>
Q02	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Laurence Holmes) [6110]		<p>The Council's approach under Step 1 - Site Hierarchy Criteria - is considered appropriate and compliant with NPPF.</p> <p>Considered appropriate to seek land for housing in low performing Green Belt due to evidence in SHELAA on lack of supply on non-Green Belt sites.</p> <p>Agree that DLP Site 16 is a Priority 5 site and suitable for Green Belt release as it lies within a parcel of low-performance Green Belt with strong, defensible boundaries and is proximate to the facilities and services of Solihull town centre.</p>
Q02	Hampton Road Developments Ltd [4643]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	<p>Generally agree with the approach taken to the site selection process at Hampton Road, but scoring of sites 214 and 215 is inconsistent in step 1. Both sites are located adjacent to site 213 but have different scores.</p> <p>Whilst the further away the site is from the urban area, footpaths and roads, the site may become decreasingly accessible, but accessibility increases closer to the canal. A score of 6 rather than 9 is more appropriate and consistent with the score attributed to site 213.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	Heyford Developments agree with the methodology of the site selection process but strongly disagree with the resulting scores in Step 2 for Draft Allocation Site 8 Hampton Road and Amber Site A5 Land at Blue Lake Road. Sites 166/213: identified as blue in Step 1, exhibit a number of concerns, setting of listed building, Local Wildlife Sites, TPOs/hedgerows. Whilst could be mitigated, nonsensical to score green in Step 2. Should be red. Sites 104/413: yellow in Step 1, no significant impacts, should be identified as green in Step 2.
Q02	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		Noted that the relative suitability of a site will be judged against whether harm to the historic environment can be mitigated. Would be helpful for the Council to confirm that the above accords with the need to: -Take sufficient account of the evidence base to avoid or minimise harm to the significance of heritage assets (NPPF para 190) -Attach great weight to the conservation of effected heritage assets (NPPF para.193), and -Have had due regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of effected listed buildings in accordance with S66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and
Q02	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	we raise certain concerns with the methodology of the site selection processes. Mainly, the reliance on the Accessibility Study, and lack of consideration of other sustainable modes of transport, is a failing which needs to be remedied. Further, there would appear to be anomalies within the assessment process and the Council should ensure this is standardised. the Site at Jacobean Lane (submitted to the Council in December 2018), should be included as a preferred option given its positive assessment against the SHELAA and site assessment methodology.
Q02	IM Land [3900]	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs Rachel Best) [2448]	Methodology is useful, but Step 1 should focus on accessibility as well as green belt, and Step 2 should take account of other evidence such as SHELAA, Landscape Character and SA, and allow for refinement as evidence, such as LCA relates to large parcels and not necessarily sites, that may be a small part of a parcel. Accessibility needs to be weighted similar to green belt as evidence available and updated and should reflect Accessibility Mapping. Site Assessments document should follow same sequence with Step 1 at the beginning of the Assessment followed by Step 2 factors.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Fiona Lee-McQueen) [6265]	<p>Considered Step 1 - Hierarchy criteria does not fully align with NPPF recommendations.</p> <p>Accessibility should be more strongly featured in Step 1 and not as in Footnote 35.</p> <p>Five purposes of Green Belt should not be considered ahead of Acessibility.</p> <p>Step 2 should include sites well served by public transport in 'factors in favour'.</p> <p>In reference to Site 141, this site would be advanced to Step 2 as proximity to Earlswood Station is an accessible location.</p>
Q02	IM Properties [279]	Marrons Planning (Daniel Robinson-Wells) [6202]	<p>Criteria b i and ii of the sequential approach in DLP2016 should be merged to reflect paragraph 138 of NPPF, as no distinction between previously developed land and land well-served by public transport. Delete reference to land lost to committed development as not consistent with NPPF.</p>
Q02	Janet Royle [4227]		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Call for Sites doesn't always give the best sites - often they benefit landowners and developers rather than local people. 2. Building on former Greenbelt land irrevocably changes the character of an area from rural to conurbation 3.Arden Triangle benefits landowners whilst destroying a rural entry to Knowle Village Centre 4. Why wasn't land by the M42 considered as more suitable for development?
Q02	Jeanette McGarry [4247]		<p>Factors such as accessibility, hard constraints and sustainability are subjective and require quantifiable measures, categorisation and weighting where appropriate. A similar approach to that adopted for the SHELAA.</p> <p>There is no consideration given to any assessment for highways.</p>
Q02	Joanna Johnson [5985]		<p>Why are there so many homes proposed near and around Shirley? There are other areas in Solihull, or in the areas of Birmingham that border onto Solihull that could be used, especially as they are brownfield sites, not Green Belt.</p>
Q02	Joelle Hill [4425]		<p>My understanding is that there are a number of flaws with the methodology of this review.</p> <p>Sustainability. The government provides a sustainability calculator which if applied consistently does not produce a sustainable result in some cases for the sites identified in the plan. The sustainability measure has not been used for all the sites proposed in the plan.</p> <p>There is an over emphasis on large release of green belt land rather than smaller infill developments that would have less impact on the borough. This is against government policy.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Step 2 refinement is contrary to NPPF. Not appropriate to introduce physical boundaries in otherwise open green belt areas. Methodology should set out preferred criteria for defining clear defensible boundaries. Some red sites ruled out due to lack of defensible boundaries, whilst some sites rated green have caveat that physical boundaries will be created. Methodology not consistently and logically applied across all sites.
Q02	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	- Do not consider there to be any issues with the first stage of the site selection/assessment process. - Second stage of process is highly complex and respondent does not agree with the methodology of the site selection process. The numerous elements of
Q02	Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]		There are significant flaws in both the methodology and its application. The site selection process must be set in the context of the overall housing need and Spatial Strategy, neither of which have been updated for this consultation but should be in the light of new evidence. In testing the appropriateness of sites, consideration must be given to the impact of new development on the physical, economic and social infrastructure of the settlement and on its character and distinctiveness. The methodology does not do so. There are also significant variations in the scoring assessments of sites which require justification.
Q02	L Adams [5253]		Solihull conurbation is slowly becoming a suburb of Birmingham, Coventry, Redditch etc. Soon, if building at this rate continues, there will be no green spaces of value left.
Q02	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Inconsistencies in Step 1 assessment for Site 195 Damson Parkway. Consider that site should be priority 5 (not 6) and be assessed under Step 2, as evidenced in LVI statement. Consideration of Amber Sites includes little additional analysis and there are inconsistencies between site assessments. Site 195 should be identified as Green or Amber Site
Q02	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Inconsistencies in Step 1 assessment for Site 199 Four Ashes Road. Consider that site should be priority 5 (not 6) and be assessed under Step 2, as evidenced in LVI statement. Consideration of Amber Sites includes little additional analysis and there are inconsistencies between site assessments. Site 199 should undergo Step 2 assessment and be identified as Green or Amber Site

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Inconsistencies in Step 1 assessment which has led to higher scores and GBA approach has led to inconsistencies in assessing edge of settlement sites. Consideration of Amber Sites includes little additional analysis and there are inconsistencies between site assessments. Assessment of Site 197 Berkswell Road, Meriden based on wider parcel rather than smaller area off Berkswell Road. Based on evidence in the LV Statement, it is considered that Site 197 should be lower performing in the GBA and identified as priority 5 in Step 1. Under Step 2 it should have been assessed as a Green or Amber Site.
Q02	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Inconsistencies in Step 1 assessment which has led to higher scores and GBA approach has led to inconsistencies in assessing edge of settlement sites. Consider that there is no justification for Site 196 Bickenhill Road, identified as priority 5 in Step 1 and Red in Step 2, not to be identified as a Green or Amber Site, as evidenced in LVI statement. Consideration of Amber Sites includes little additional analysis and there are inconsistencies between site assessments. Site 199 should undergo Step 2 assessment and be identified as Green or Amber Site.
Q02	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	See attached letter for full question response. We do not agree with the methodology deployed by the Council. Importantly, the starting point is fundamentally flawed Further comments on housing land supply, Solihull Local Plan Allocations (2013), Windfall Housing Land Supply (2018-2033), UK Central Hub Area, Q02 we do not consider the Council's delivery estimate to be robust and we will be interrogating its assertions in respect of its other proposed allocations when the Council publishes a detailed housing trajectory
Q02	Landowner Winterton Farm [5795]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Object to the assessment of site 173 in the Site Assessment document. There is no definition for 'isolated' within the NPPF. The Council's assessment of the site is incorrect and it should have been assessed as a Priority 6 site. Request reassessment. Do not support the Step 2 'refining criteria' and the lack of clarity on how sites have been assessed against the factors listed in the table. It is unclear how the Council has rated the sites in relation to Step 2 and clarity is sought on this matter.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Lichfield District Council (Mr Stephen Stray) [5384]		The refinements regarding methodology and approach to site selection appear to be soundly based on a sustainable approach to allocating sites based on their previously developed / greenfield status, accessibility to services and impacts for the Green Belt in line with the NPPF approach. However, the flaw remains that the identification of the additional 2000 to meet the shortfall has not been justified for the reasons previously set out. Accordingly, further sites may need to be identified and released.
Q02	Mark Taft [3595]		Methodology of site selection failure to meet NPPF2 par 3.32 and government sustainability scorecard.
Q02	Michael Moran [5681]		Having lived in Shirley since 1984 I am concerned at the disproportionate number of new homes that are targeted on the immediate countryside belt surrounding the area. More equitable distribution of homes throughout the borough is required and I am concerned that responsibility is shared
Q02	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Basic elements of the Methodology acceptable and workable. Other elements are flawed and over complicated. Non-compliant with Government policy on strong defensible Green Belt boundaries. No reference to creating boundaries in NPPF. Lack of consistency, particularly when comparing sites in the same location. Site assessments incomplete in some instances. Flawed judgements or lack of sound reasons why some sites allocated/rejected /de-allocated. No advantage in creating yellow, blue and subsequently amber sites. This is unnecessary and adds to confusion and complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them as proposed allocations.
Q02	Miss Susan Hillitt [5660]		The criterion for selection appears to be to select the areas already heavily populated to leave untouched large areas of countryside
Q02	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Step 2 refinement is contrary to NPPF. Not appropriate to introduce physical boundaries in otherwise open green belt areas. Methodology should set out preferred criteria for defining clear defensible boundaries. Some red sites ruled out due to lack of defensible boundaries, whilst some sites rated green have caveat that physical boundaries will be created. Methodology not consistently and logically applied across all sites. Absence of evidence eg more detailed studies following Strategic Growth Study/Landscape Character Assessment. Contend that despite use of Standard Methodology based on 2014 household projections, there is still no signed Statement of Common Ground, (contrary to NPPF),

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Step 2 refinement is contrary to NPPF. Not appropriate to introduce physical boundaries in otherwise open green belt areas. Methodology should set out preferred criteria for defining clear defensible boundaries. Some red sites ruled out due to lack of defensible boundaries, whilst some sites rated green have caveat that physical boundaries will be created. Methodology not consistently and logically applied across all sites.
Q02	Mr & Mrs J King [3916]	PRW Strategic Advice (Paul Watson) [3914]	<p>Rather than packaging sites which are geographically clustered together precludes the effective exploration of the potential for strategic land releases which could, through comprehensive treatment of an area, deliver new homes, services & green infrastructure in a way which minimises impacts on landscape & the Green Belt and which so would establish Green Belt boundaries which are clear.</p> <p>The 'partial approach' results in poor scores for individual sites in terms of Green Belt boundary definition and also impacts on assessments of accessibility and service provision.</p> <p>Flaw in methodology- clusters of sites need to be assessed as a group not individually</p>
Q02	Mr & Mrs J King [3916]	PRW Strategic Advice (Paul Watson) [3914]	<p>Simple overlay of built up areas of Earlswood/Wythall would illustrate land owner/developer interest. Potential for clustering sites to explore sustainable new settlement has not been assessed by methodology.</p> <p>Such a proposition is recognised to require effective cross-boundary working between a number of different local planning authorities and so would engage the Duty to Cooperate but it is a reasonable alternative strategy to that being pursued by the Local Plan Review and so should be the subject of Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
Q02	Mr & Mrs Williams [6253]	Oakwood Planning Ltd (Mrs Jayne Cashmore) [5447]	<p>It is agreed that brownfield sites should be prioritised, but sites which are partly brownfield and partly greenfield should be prioritised over solely greenfield.</p> <p>If a site is not correctly assessed as Green at Step 1, it is agreed the accessibility criteria should be refined as part of Step 2, but this needs to be carried out accurately.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mr Adam Hunter [3332]		<p>Site 4 does not perform well against Refinement Criteria: Not in accordance with spatial strategy which only supports 'proportional additions' to lower order settlements. Category 3 site within the SHELAA. Masterplans document shows strong landscape boundary and Ancient Woodland on boundary between site and Dickens Heath. This is an existing strong defensible green belt boundary that would be breached. Proposed Green Belt boundaries would be narrow rural lanes with open countryside beyond, and not represent strong defensible boundaries. Medium/High Accessibility Score, yet other sites with similar score have been discounted on accessibility grounds. Very low landscape capacity rating/important historical landscape.</p>
Q02	Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]		<p>The methodology does not reflect the Harm to the greenbelt because it both fails to look at the cumulative impact of removing individual sites which were only assessed for their individual contribution to the purposes of the greenbelt and in some cases even ignores the Atkins greenbelt report. It also makes up public transport accessibility scores that ignore the Council's own Solihull Connect report. It also fails to take into account the relative public amenity benefits of sites in terms of their public accessibility and contribution to well being.</p>
Q02	Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]		<p>The site selection process is flawed and inconsistently applied. All reasonable alternatives have not been examined, in particular, options put forward in the Strategic Growth Study. The overarching Spatial Strategy is poorly applied and has not been up-dated to address identified strategic development opportunities. Undue reliance on larger sites. No consideration of safeguarded land, long-term development needs or enduring green belt boundaries.</p>
Q02	Mr Bob Holtham [3530]		<p>The methodology and conclusions made in the document on the sites within the Arden Triangle and the Blue Lake Road 'Amber' site are too broad brush and do not address local landscape and character issues. I support the Representations made on the Plan by KDBH and Crestwood and also the Representation made by Pegasus Planning Group on the two sites.</p>
Q02	Mr Brian Hillman [6003]		<p>I object to the conclusions on Site Assessment Methodology for the proposed Arden Triangle draft allocation and also the Blue Lake Road Amber Site and I completely support the arguments put forward in the KDBH and the Pegasus Planning Representations.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mr Bruce Richard [5691]		Disagree with the methodology of the site selection process. The 'amber sites' should not have been included in this supplementary consultation as they have been assessed by the Council and rejected. It is unclear how the Council have determined that they are 'less harmful'.
Q02	Mr Christopher McDermott [3693]		I'm not sure I understand why the methodology has been used or the methods chosen
Q02	Mr D Deanshaw [2226]		This is very poor, a wider view of potential development is essential. Many sites have been considered in isolation. In some cases adjacent sites could be absorbed and create interesting enclaves
Q02	Mr Darren Douglas [5276]		We object to this further consultation being undertaken on sites that the Council have assessed and rejected. We are also unclear how the Council have concluded these sites are less harmful.
Q02	Mr David Patterson [5526]		Disagree with the methodology of the site selection process. The 'amber sites' should not have been included in this supplementary consultation as they have been assessed by the Council and rejected. It is unclear how the Council have determined that they are 'less harmful'.
Q02	Mr David Varley [3385]		Methodology is questionable in determining the sites selected in the Borough, specifically Site 1. Fails to recognise importance of protecting the Meriden Gap at this narrowest point between settlement and Coventry, or merits of development on west of Balsall Common. HS2 is not new committed development and should not be used to justify rating for Site 1.
Q02	Mr Eric Homer [3721]		Site 13 to become a formal public open space. Disproportionate 38% of additional housing in Shirley South. The potential of other areas in the Borough that can absorb some of this capacity should be more ardently examined. Proposals are contrary to the objective of protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements. Developing residential buildings in the town centre makes good sense. Unacceptable increase in traffic volumes and decreasing air quality. Increase in urban sprawl. Full utilisation of Brownfield sites across the West Midlands Combined Authority has not been made. Build near employment areas, not miles away in Shirley.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		<p>The categorisation on page 18 is based on entirely subjective assessments. The differences between them cannot be judged objectively. Indeed priorities 2 and 6b have identical names.</p> <p>Sites are judged in isolation with no consideration given to the surrounding area. For example a site in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap must make a greater Green Belt contribution than one elsewhere.</p> <p>The methodology places great weight on the Atkins GBA which is not reliable enough to be used as the basis for such far reaching proposals.</p>
Q02	Mr Graham Thomas [5361]		<p>The site selection process ONLY identifies sites. They are then almost exclusively allocated for the great God of Housing.</p> <p>Greater attention needs to be given, and sites allocated, for the provision of community infrastructure, for example additional health care space, parking, recreational facilities (not just open spaces), traffic management, (particularly bus and heavy vehicle traffic), and shopping and community facilities.</p> <p>Particularly in the Balsall Common and Dickens Heath areas with old and/or very limited facilities.</p>
Q02	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		<p>The council does not appear to follow its own recommendations.</p> <p>Balsall Common is clearly identified with existing traffic congestion issues, poor transport integration with the wider area and low local employment opportunities, all of which are supposed to be factors in considering development locations.</p> <p>Adding 1500 home and around 6000 inhabitants will strain local services and add great pressure to the local road network as most residents will have to travel by car to places of work outside the village.</p>
Q02	Mr J Allen [4072]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Paul Harris) [4070]	<p>Do not disagree in principle, but issues with execution and lack of transparency. The SA is part of the refinement process, but some sites are still assessed as clusters and not given a full SA, therefore disregard for site specifics.</p> <p>Need further evidence of how the overall assessment has been arrived at. The selection process is subjective and confused. Stratford-upon-Avon use a more refined approach.</p> <p>Assessment methodology is illogical, overly subjective and inconsistent. The assessment framework does not allow for constraints to be weighted differently (e.g hard and constraints). The process does not allow for mitigation of soft constraints.</p>
Q02	Mr J Davies [2104]		Maximum use to be made of brown field or derelict sites

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mr John Cumberlidge [5937]		Why are so many new homes being built in Shirley
Q02	Mr John Cumberlidge [5937]		Why are so many new homes being built in Shirley
Q02	Mr John Gibbs [5865]		<p>There is a preponderance of new dwellings proposed in the Shirley area. Sites 11, 12 and 26 account for up to 1940 dwellings, and, in addition, Site 4 is, in effect, butted up to Site 26. Site 4 adds an additional 700 dwellings to the area.</p> <p>Additionally, Shirley is absorbing new homes within its boundaries, in developments like Poppy Fields in Haslucks Green Road, which comprises more than 100 dwellings, and Solihull Village on the previous Powergen site, which will comprise an additional 260 apartments. In addition other accommodation has been added recently in Shirley around the Parkgate development.</p>
Q02	Mr John Hornby [5851]		<p>In broad terms I agree with the methodology. However, the application of the methodology to certain sites assessed is flawed.</p> <p>In particular, the presumption that ribbon development, no matter how well established it may be or how limited it may be in extent, should result in a scoring down on character and quality is not appropriate. Intrinsic qualities of unbuilt development should be taken into account, as should the visual amenity to local residents.</p> <p>As an example, the assessment of Site 413 (Amber - ref A5) is flawed in this</p>
Q02	Mr Jon Sellars [5962]		<p>1. Why are there so many new homes in South Shirley?</p> <p>2. What are you going to do to support the local transport network that is already overloaded?</p> <p>3. Why are you removing so much green belt?</p> <p>4. Why are you not making denser populated housing?</p> <p>5. Why do you not make it easier for elderly to move thereby freeing up housing stock?</p> <p>6. Why are you not developing more brownfield sites?</p> <p>7. Why are you not tackling unoccupied houses?</p>
Q02	Mr Keith Tindall [3020]		In terms of Q02 I am pleased that its application has been applied appropriately in relation to Grange Farm resulting in it being dismissed for development, as it falls within productively farmed Green Belt and has no defensive boundary against mass development leading to urban sprawl and erosion of the Meriden Gap.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		<p>Site selection process fundamentally flawed due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A failure to consider the aggregate impact and loss of green belt amenity from additional Coventry build and HS2. 2. Selection of greenfield sites in preference to a number of brownfield sites 3. Insufficient weight given to the poor transport links in the Balsall Common area 4. The rationale for the excessive burden of development for Balsall Common is not given (1690 new homes vs 3900 existing) when only 900 homes (vs 8000 existing) are proposed for Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath.
Q02	Mr Neil Jeffries [5728]		<p><u>Why are so many homes near Shirley?</u></p>
Q02	Mr Paul Guggiari [5936]		<p>There is a disproportional amount of houses allocated for Shirley South (38% of Solihull's allocation). With the advent of HS2 Shirley South is one of the furthest areas from it and will therefore contribute greatly to travel congestion. Shirley does not have a vast amount of parkland, which whilst it is on the edge of the green belt has masked this. Once a conurbation is built on this green belt the lack of green space in Shirley will become more evident. When Site 13 was removed it should of been replaced elsewhere in the borough not with Site 26.</p>
Q02	Mr Phillip Griffiths [5939]		<p>Object to further consultation being undertaken on the Amber sites that the Council have already assessed and rejected. (In particular Amber site ref A7). It potentially gives promoters of these sites a 'way in' which is contrary to the Council's own assessment and conclusions reached.</p>
Q02	Mr Ray Foxall [5746]		<p><u>Why is site selection focused so much on Shirley were there is already a huge traffic problem</u></p>
Q02	Mr Richard Batchelor [5942]		<p>I object to the inclusion of Amber omitted sites, particularly in the case of the land at the rear of 114 to 118 Widney Manor Road, Solihull, where a planning application (2010/648/S) for residential purposes in 2010, and the subsequent appeal was dismissed in 2011. The inclusion of such Amber omitted sites gives the promoters of these sites a 'way in' to challenge a previous decision upheld on appeal</p>
Q02	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		<p>The Greenbelt review is questionable. It appears to undervalue the importance of the Meriden Gap.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mr Robin Easterby [5943]		Please see attached letter. (Letter not attached on JDi. Email sent 09.05.19 to respondent, Robin Easterby via PSP email address. Email reply on 09.05.19 stating that he was unable to resend letter but..."I suspect you may already have seen similar contents from other objecting residents on Widney Manor Road as it was a standard letter recommended by the Widney Manor Action Group. Basically I object to the proposed development as it would fundamentally change the nature of the area, is green belt, and is an example of garden grabbing at its worst. The traffic along Widney Manor Road has dramatically increased since I moved into 136 and the proposal will only make matters worse."
Q02	Mr Stephen Harvell [6159]		Why are there so many homes being built near Shirley
Q02	Mr Steve Coathup [6078]		The spatial strategy states that green belt development should be the last of the various options available, but this plan has moved significantly towards green belt development than previous versions. The strategy also states that there needs to be a balance between large singular developments and dispersed smaller sites. Clearly, this objective has been disregarded in the current plan
Q02	Mr Steven Rushton [3211]		In the report you state that "The majority of sites submitted are not included as a compelling case for their inclusion has not been made; largely because they are located in the Green Belt..." However, this is resulting in what look like common sense sites (eg parts of 33, set amongst existing housing developments) being removed from the plan while green belt such as the land to the south of Dog Kennel Lane (site 12, or 122 on the map) is now included in the plan.
Q02	Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]		No The site selection process does not follow the NPPF2 sustainability analysis and could be subject to a legal challenge. The council should re-evaluate site 4 in particular using the government approved scorecard process. The selection focuses on large-scale green belt releases, which goes against government advice that a mix of sites should be selected. We've already see an increase in flooding in and around Shirley with the proposed plans put new & current properties more at risk of flooding Mott McDonald traffic surveys not conducted prior to site inclusion into DLP

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Step 2 refinement is contrary to NPPF. Not appropriate to introduce physical boundaries in otherwise open green belt areas. Methodology should set out preferred criteria for defining clear defensible boundaries. Some red sites ruled out due to lack of defensible boundaries, whilst some sites rated green have caveat that physical boundaries will be created. Methodology not consistently and logically applied across all sites.
Q02	Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]		site selection does not meet NPPF2 standards. Council need to review Sustainability appraisal in line with the criteria set out in the Government scorecard
Q02	Mrs Brenda Clayson [5668]		Far too many houses being planned for the Blythe area and Shirley is taking the brunt of the allocations. The allocations are not being evenly distributed across the Borough.
Q02	Mrs Carla Hughes [3228]		No, I object to the method of site selection as no consideration has been given to the infrastructure of the area to support such an obscene number of new homes
Q02	Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]		Why is such a large percentage (38%) of new houses being built in Shirley area, this seems unfair.
Q02	Mrs Carol Clarke [5822]		Site selection place's 38% of the total in Shirley/Blythe which given the size of the borough seems disproportionate
Q02	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		Any Greenbelt analysis that allows housing in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap would appear seriously flawed
Q02	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		It is not clear what methodology was used to plan for so many houses to be built in Shirley. It is unclear what the reasoning is for this. The infrastructure we have in Shirley is struggling with the housing that exists already. It is disproportionate. More use of brown land and less addition to existing housing estates would help to create more open areas and help limit the "sprawl" merging into one mass.
Q02	Mrs Clare Heath [5871]		Please see attached letter
Q02	Mrs Debbie Grinnell [5765]		of new local housing proposed 38% is based in Shirley!!! This is way too high, suggest using other areas such as Dorridge, Knowle, Lapworth etc - I believe we have given up enough of our land without the infrastructure to support it.
Q02	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Green belt land should not be included - brownfield sites have to take priority.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mrs E Hedley [3516]		In testing the appropriateness of sites, consideration should be given to the impact of new development on the physical, economic and social infrastructure of the village and its character and distinctiveness. The methodology does not do this and needs to be clearer. There are significant variations in the scoring of sites which require justification, notably in respect of Hampton Road. Site 213 performs highly for green belt purpose 1 and is remote, but assessed as medium/high accessibility, whilst sites 214/215 are assessed as unsuitable. Please also see the response of the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum which I support and fully endorse.
Q02	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		SMBC may have to release land from Green Belt status but the main purpose of Green Belt to stop urban sprawl between settlements must be paramount. The advent of HS2 is not a reason to release land from Green Belt otherwise the whole length of the line would be built on. The methodology purports to be objective but its application is subjective and inconsistent. Sites are judged in isolation with no consideration given to the cumulative effects on loss of green belt especially in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap.
Q02	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		Disagree with methodology. Significant inconsistencies in the application of the methodology which undermine the integrity of the whole site selection process. Sustainability analysis does not comply with Para 3.32 of NPPF. E.g. Site 4 would score 30%. Assessment excludes a number of smaller sites from the SA. Strategy continues to focus on large scale Green Belt release for developments. Smaller sites should be reassessed as could meet housing need in more sensitive way, with less impact on Green Belt and local character.
Q02	Mrs Jill Hillman [5492]		I object to your conclusion on site assessment methodology for the proposed Arden Triangle draft allocation and also the Blue Lake Road Amber site and I support the arguments in the KDBH and Pegasus Planning representations.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mrs Johanna Sahi-Proto [5391]		<p>We do not agree with the methodology of the site selection process - it is not 'good planning' to then ignore this assessment and consult on the Amber omitted sites.</p> <p>We are also unclear how the Council have concluded these (amber) sites are less harmful.</p> <p>See appeal attached - no material changes to the site/development, yet it has been included as 'less harmful'. Inclusion of amber sites gives developers a 'way in'. There must be better sites, outside of using back gardens to provide the</p>
Q02	Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]		<p>I find the site selection process to be fundamentally flawed due to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A failure to consider the aggregate impact and loss of green belt amenity from additional Coventry build and HS2. 2. Selection of greenfield sites in preference to a number of brownfield sites 3. Insufficient weight given to the poor transport links/higher car use in the Balsall Common area 4. The rationale for the excessive burden of development for Balsall Common is not given (1690 new homes vs 3900 existing) when only 900 homes (vs 8000 existing) are proposed for Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath.
Q02	Mrs Katrina Jamieson [5817]		<p>We do not want any building on Widney Manor road between the college and the station. There is too much traffic now</p>
Q02	Mrs Linda Homer [3729]		<p>Site 13 to become a formal public open space.</p> <p>Disproportionate 38% of additional housing in Shirley South.</p> <p>The potential of other areas in the Borough that can absorb some of this capacity should be more ardently examined.</p> <p>Proposals are contrary to the objective of protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements.</p> <p>Developing residential buildings in the town centre makes good sense.</p> <p>Unacceptable increase in traffic volumes and decreasing air quality.</p> <p>Increase in urban sprawl.</p> <p>Full utilisation of Brownfield sites across the West Midlands Combined Authority has not been made.</p> <p>Build near employment areas, not miles away in Shirley.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mrs Lisa Mitchell [5498]		Disagree with the methodology of the site selection process. The 'amber sites' should not have been included in this supplementary consultation as they have been assessed by the Council and rejected. It is unclear how the Council have determined that they are 'less harmful'.
Q02	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		The methodology and conclusions made in the document on the sites within the Arden Triangle and the Blue Lake Road 'Amber' site are too broad brush and do not address local landscape and character issues. I support the Representations made on the Plan by KDBH and Crestwood and also the Representation made by Pegasus Planning Group on the two sites.
Q02	Mrs Marilyn Jones [5718]		Whilst I accept the need for the proposed housing and I'm not asking for the amount in Shirley to be reduced I would like to know why there's not more sites in Knowle, Dorridge, Hockley Heath, Central Solihull.
Q02	Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]		I believe this plan does meet the standards set out in the NPPF2, the analysis of sustainability on the whole process needs to be looked at again. Why have so many retirement homes been build along the A34 where the air quality is very poor.
Q02	Mrs Pamela Robertson [5736]		This site, the land at the rear of 114 to118 Widney Manor Road Solihull has already been assessed and rejected by the council for further residential purposes.This is yet another attempt at 'garden grabbing'
Q02	Mrs Ruth Wolinski [5727]		We do not agree with the methodology of the site selection process. We object to this further consultation being undertaken on sites that the Council have assessed and rejected. The inclusion of Amber omitted sites gives the promoters of these sites a way in which in our view is contrary to the Councils own assessment and conclusions reached. We live in fear of this further attempt to 'Garden Grab'. In our view the Council should not have included the Amber omitted sites as part of the Supplementary Consultation.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		<p>1. Disproportionate planned number of homes in and near Shirley compared to rest of Borough. (Blythe Ward will receive 38% of the proposed housing allocation). B90 is being treated as the poor relation in the Borough. Other areas, such as KDBH, do not have the same proposed numbers.</p> <p>2. Area will become one huge concrete housing estate and car park with reduction in Public Open Space.</p> <p>3. Area currently has good balance of housing and open areas to benefit all. Fauna, flora and wildlife and open areas thus enhancing quality of life for residents. Wildlife will be devastated.</p> <p>4. Current infrastructure cannot cope - major congestion issues already around A34, Dickens Heath, Tanworth Lane, Haslucks Green Road, Bills Lane.</p> <p>5. The overall quality of life of the people already living here will be grossly affected. Major detrimental affects on people's health, contrary to Policy 18 of the Draft Local Plan and National planning guidance.</p> <p>6. Flooding issues in Shirley will get worse.</p> <p>7. Hypocrisy from Council who recently refused the extension of a local sports club due to detrimental effects on local environment. Now wanting to build all over the area.</p>
Q02	Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]		<p>why is so much housing been concentrated in such a small area, almost 40% in the Shirley/Blythe Villages area on Green belt land encroaching on the much needed gaps between villages. The small narrow roads in this area are already at a standstill at peak times.</p>
Q02	Ms Rebecca Hess [5754]		<p>Please see attached letter. My husband and I believe that the methodology of the site selection is flawed and we do not agree that it is logical to consult again on sites that the Council itself has already considered and rejected in recent years. The Amber sites should not have been included in the supplementary consultation. There has been no change to the local and national planning position since the Council's last refusal of planning applications on the land behind 114-118 Widney Manor Road. Garden grab is not the way to provide properly planned housing.</p>
Q02	Ms Wendy Gault [6134]		<p>The methodology used to identify sites has not been applied in a systematic transparent way particularly with regard to the green belt analysis, and additional pressure on the green belt with HS2, local amenity and infrastructure e.g rail services in Balsall Common, the line cannot accommodate more trains and they are already massively overcrowded vis a vis other local areas where infrastructure more able to cope with housing but sites not identified. The selection methodology is not transparent and it is not clear how sites have been selected or how the assessment criteria have been scored and applied.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Natural England (Ms Hazel McDowall) [6137]		<p>Natural England welcomes the inclusion of landscape capacity in the factors against in the refinement criteria.</p> <p>We advocate allocations on land of least environmental and amenity value. In particular they avoid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * designated sites/priority habitats * Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land * areas at risk of flooding * brownfield sites of high environmental value
Q02	Nic Heath [5576]		<p>Disagree with the methodology of the site selection process. The 'amber sites' should not have been included in this supplementary consultation as they have been assessed by the Council and rejected. It is unclear how the Council have determined that they are 'less harmful'.</p>
Q02	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient brownfield sites allocated of 35 ha (p84) within the borough for housing. More brownfield sites should be allocated. - Kingshurst Village Centre has no masterplan, and future housing proposals are not provided. - Majority of residential
Q02	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		<p>The Council should also provide maximum flexibility within its overall housing land supply to respond to changing circumstances, to treat the housing requirement as a minimum rather than a maximum and to provide choice and competition in the land market.</p> <p>Housing delivery is maximised where a wide mix of sites provides choice for consumers, allows places to grow in sustainable ways and creates opportunities to diversify the construction sector.</p>
Q02	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		<p>Methodology unsound as fails to meet NPPF, not based on appropriate strategy justified by evidence or consideration of alternatives. 2 stage approach to sieving sites on basis of narrative broad area analysis lacks robustness for sites excluded in first round. Agglomeration of sites of different characteristics for SA unsound</p> <p>Failure to test all potential development sites on a consistent basis, one with another to the extent that the choice of development sites is not justified.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>we broadly agree with the methodology but raise issues with the manner in which it has been applied to the site assessment process. We object to the manner in which our site (site assessment reference 404) has been assessed as 'red'. We do not agree with the conclusion that it will have 'severe or widespread impacts that are not outweighed by the benefits of the proposal'. Given the geographic similarities, we make a direct comparison to site 41, Land at Whitlock's End Farm; and site 176, Land to the West of Dickens Heath, both of which are assessed as 'green' sites and are identified as draft allocations (draft Plan sites 26 and 4 respectively). Site has been assessed as low accessibility to the primary school despite being adjacent to it. There is a formal agreement with Bellway to create footpath linkages through adjacent site which would reduce time taken to walk to the school. Public transport is also incorrectly assessed as being low / medium for same reason walking distance to station is reduced. Assessment states no footpaths however as stated above a new footpath will be provided along Rumbush Lane. These conclusions on accessibility are supported further by the appeal decision for the adjacent Bellway site. It is clear the site is close to a variety of services and facilities at Tidbury Green and Dickens Heath and a number of sustainable transport options are available which will be enhanced through the development of the enhanced Bellway scheme. The site is similar to the proposed draft allocations in terms of contribution to the purposes of the green belt. Requests site is reassessed based on evidence submitted. In terms of landscape the site has been assessed as 'within a landscape character of high sensitivity, medium landscape value and very low capacity to accommodate change'. However landscape and visual appraisal undertaken by Barton Willmore Landscape concludes that the site can accommodate development which is of a type and scale that reflects the existing development within Tidbury Green. Mitigation is proposed to reduce visual permeability to ensure that the development can be accommodated without undermining the function of the Green Belt and without causing harm to the landscape. As such landscape should not be a reason to object to the principle of development on the site. Disagrees with the conclusion 'the development would result in an unacceptable incursion into the countryside and cause coalescence by narrowing the gap between Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green'. Nothing in the Council's evidence that places a higher</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>We broadly agree with the methodology but raise issues with the manner in which it has been applied to the site assessment process. Specifically, we object to the manner in which our site (site assessment reference 407) has been assessed as 'red'. We do not agree with the conclusion that it will have 'severe or widespread impacts that are not outweighed by the benefits of the proposal'. We disagree that no defensible Green Belt boundary can be established. The site comprises predominantly grassland pasture and surrounding vegetation. The sense of openness is, therefore, already limited to some extent. Development of the site would contribute towards increasing the built form and therefore reduce the sense of openness experienced in views across the site where available. However, that sense of openness has already been eroded by the surrounding built form. The site has clear boundaries that follow Widney Manor Road to the west, strong vegetation to the east and the built form and rear gardens of properties along Lovelace Avenue to the south. development of the site will not contribute to 'unrestricted sprawl' or 'the merging of neighbouring towns'. We do not agree that landscape presents a constraint to development as the character assessment is broad in nature and a more site-specific assessment may come to a different view. We consider the site has very high accessibility. It is within a highly sustainable location, being in very close proximity to Widney Manor Station, St. Alphege primary school and Solihull Sixth Form College. A number of secondary schools are also relatively close. There are no constraints which cannot be mitigated.</p>
Q02	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Site 79 (part of wider site allocation 21 - Pheasant Oak Farm). We broadly agree with the methodology but note there are issues with the manner in which it has been applied to the site assessment process across the Borough. Whilst we support the positive assessment of this site, we would query the Council's conclusions that the site has a 'low level of accessibility'. By the Council's own criteria on page 18 of the draft Plan, the site is accessible as it is 'on the edge of an urban area' and 'on the edge of a settlement that has a wide range of services including a primary school and a range of retail facilities'. The site is around 15 minutes' walk from Balsall Common Primary School.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>We broadly agree with the methodology but raise issues with the manner in which it has been applied to the site assessment process. Specifically we object to the manner in which our site (site assessment reference 416) has been assessed as 'red'. We do not agree with the conclusion that it will have 'severe or widespread impacts that are not outweighed by the benefits of the proposal'. Site is well enclosed by defensible boundaries to the west by Ashford Lane and a detached dwelling; to the south by School Road and a detached dwelling; and to the north by another detached dwelling and agricultural buildings. Do not agree that landscape presents a constraint to development, the character assessment is broad in nature and a more site-specific assessment would arrive at a different conclusion having regard to the context of this site. A number of larger allocations have similar landscape characteristics. Site adjacent to 84 School Lane is assessed as green and our site could result in an identical conclusion. Site contains good accessibility to services and facilities in the village. This includes Hockley Heath Primary School and a bus service to Dorridge, which contains a rail station with direct links to Solihull and Birmingham. Other nearby services in Hockley Heath can be accessed by a short walk or cycle. Hockley Heath should be higher in the settlement hierarchy and identified as suitable for higher levels of growth. We consider that Hockley Heath is a sustainable location for additional housing growth as it has a sufficient range of services and facilities within the village, including a primary school.</p> <p>There are no constraints which cannot be mitigated, including heritage, flooding, ecology, trees and access. Development here would not adversely impact upon the character of the settlement.</p> <p>Improved accessibility is proposed for properties along School Road to and from the village centre through the provision of a footpath.</p> <p>The site is in single ownership and is available for development with no legal or ownership problems.</p> <p>It is free from significant constraints and there is strong market demand for housing in this area, it can therefore be considered deliverable (from the point of Local Plan adoption) in terms of the definition within the NPPF.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>We broadly agree with the methodology but raise issues with the manner in which it has been applied to the site assessment process. Below we set out our concerns with the Council's previous assessment of the site for housing (reference 305). The site was assessed as 'red' and we do not agree with the conclusion that it will have 'severe or widespread impacts that are not outweighed by the benefits of the proposal'. The site is relatively free from constraint. Issues such as heritage, given the Grade II and II* listed buildings on Lavender Hall Lane, can be satisfactorily addressed through good design. This is bearing in mind the Council's conclusions on how their setting will already be affected by HS2. The site is within a large parcel (BA04) that is assessed as high performing this parcel probably the largest within the Borough. This is a meaningless assessment of the site's contribution to the Green Belt, particularly as it does not take into account the amendments to the Green Belt around Balsall Common that are proposed through the draft Plan. HS2 should be considered in the assessment as the proposed route runs through the site and crosses Park Lane. HS2 will provide the site with an even stronger defensible boundary to the east. In addition, Park Lane is being upgraded alongside the provision of a new roundabout with the A452 to provide construction access for HS2. Accordingly, a more site-specific Green Belt assessment which accounts for committed development would clearly result in a significantly poorer score for this parcel of land. Landscape character assessment is broad and does not take into account HS2 and the upgraded Park Lane, which will have significant implications for the surrounding landscape and its capacity for further change. the Council have identified a number of allocations with similar landscape character, including other Balsall Common allocations such as the nearby Land at Wootton Green Lane and Kenilworth Road (reference 240). Consistency in the approach to assessments is required. We consider the site has high accessibility. It is less than 15 minutes walk from Berkswell Station, less than 10 minutes walk from the Sainsburys Local. Significant number of residents within walking and cycling distance of the employment opportunities presented by this site, including several 'green' assessed sites nearby. The site should be reassessed as a green site and identified as a draft allocation for employment purposes towards the end of the Plan period.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Objection to Q02 relates to SHELAA Site 417.</p> <p>Do not agree with commentary or conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate landscape and vegetation buffer could be included in development - Disagree site would result in reduction in the gap between Hockley Heath and BVP/Cheswick Green, especially vis-À -vis proposed site at Whitlocks End Farm - Landscape Character Assessment only broad in nature, need to look at site context - Site similar to land adj. to 84 School Road and RAG should also be green - Site has good accessibility to services and facilities - Consider Hockley Heath should be considered higher in the hierarchy
Q02	Real Christmas Trees Ltd [3629]	Twelve Twenty One Planning Services (Mr Charles Robinson) [6103]	The methodology for the site selection process is agreed.
Q02	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		<p>There are significant inconsistencies in the application of the methodology which undermine the integrity of the whole site selection process. The Council should consider reviewing the SA in line with criteria set out in the Governments sustainability scorecard. For example using this to analyse site 4, the site only scored 30% sustainability putting it in a red rather than green category. It is difficult to see how some of the sites fall into the green category when they clearly have high impact. The SA excludes some smaller sites. There are missed opportunities for some red and amber sites to come forward in lesser performing green belt locations. Provision should be made for employment for existing and proposed residents in Dickens Heath, Balsall Common and Knowle.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Richard Lloyd [2616]		<p>Fails to consider harm caused by cumulative impact of loss of green belt, takes no account of encroachment within Coventry or of HS2 structures on narrowest part of Meriden Gap, which should be most valued, fails to consider agricultural land quality or accessibility, and envisages green belt release without first exhausting potential for increased densities in town centres and areas well-served by public transport.</p> <p>Accessibility assessment of Balsall Common inaccurate, as public transport poor and infrequent with trains over capacity, whereas Chiltern line is more frequent and under capacity. Berkswell station poorly served by bus and beyond walking distance for most of community and from proposed developments, with parking oversubscribed.</p> <p>Selection process distorted by Balsall Common bypass but need not substantiated as nothing in DLP refutes factors causing removal in SLP2013. Surveys show no traffic growth and HS2 not expected to generate significant growth. No evidence that alternative routes, such as shorter western bypass linking UKC with JLR at Fen End, have been evaluated. No evidence that eastern bypass can be funded by proposed developments. Much traffic originates in Balsall Common, and bypass may be ineffective due to number of roundabouts.</p> <p>Affordability not included which would direct housing to areas of highest value such as Dorridge.</p> <p>No account taken of scale and deliverability of necessary enhancements to Balsall Common centre.</p> <p>Criteria should include school availability.</p>
Q02	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Basic elements of the Methodology acceptable and workable. Other elements are flawed and over complicated.</p> <p>Non-compliant with Government policy on strong defensible Green Belt boundaries. No reference to creating boundaries in NPPF.</p> <p>Lack of consistency, particularly when comparing sites in the same location.</p> <p>Site assessments incomplete in some instances.</p> <p>Flawed judgements or lack of sound reasons why some sites allocated/rejected /de-allocated.</p> <p>No advantage in creating yellow, blue and subsequently amber sites. This is unnecessary and adds to confusion and complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them as proposed allocations.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Schools of King Edward VI in Birmingham [3520]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Miles Drew) [3519]	<p>The short answer to this question is 'no'. The deficiencies stem firstly from a flawed approach to calculating housing supply over the plan period, and then from an approach to reviewing potential housing sites that is beset by weaknesses. Generally support approach in Step 1 of prioritising brownfield, accessible and Green Belt locations.</p> <p>Do not support allocating colour status to each site. Summary explanation does not agree with diagram, as some yellow sites become red rather than amber. Text should be updated to reflect diagram.</p> <p>No guidance on how factors for and against are weighted/ranked.</p> <p>Green Belt issues should be considered in totality, and not piecemeal, i.e. the extent to which individual sites contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt.</p>
Q02	Sheila Cooper [2560]		<p>Q02 is seriously flawed. It fails to meet NPPF requirements</p> <p>Green belt analysis is unsound as no 'harm' assessments undertaken prior to commitment of resources, no cumulative harm analysis of impacts on green belt/amenity/public access/recreation/health and well-being loss, including HS2. Impact on loss of Meriden Gap ignored.</p> <p>No sound assessment of heritage and ecology.</p> <p>Failed to give significance to the actual efficiency/capacity of public transport as demonstrated by frequency/reliability/sustainability of rail/bus services.</p> <p>Investigation of a more acceptable alternative for Balsall Common By-Pass essential as unacceptable to expect residents to live with rail line/HS2/By-pass.</p>
Q02	Simon Taylor [4550]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Q02 is flawed as: - 2 criteria based purely on site assessment, with no consideration to other core principles within Local Plan such as retention of settlement demarcation. - Suggest cap to any one area, based upon percentage i
Q02	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		<p>we agree with the methodology of the site selection process.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	The approach to not seek to allocate a particular number to be accommodated in each settlement is welcomed. Concern that DLP does not include any small sites within the methodology. Whilst it is acknowledged that Step 2 assessment is subject to planning judgement, it is not particularly clear as to why some sites have been excluded. Part Site 102 Waste Lane, identifies distance to key economic assets yet conclusion indicates site could be considered as part of larger site, when parts are further away. Site 101 Old Waste Lane is priority 7 but should be 6 as adjacent site.
Q02	St Philips Ltd [6228]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Kate Green) [6227]	St Philips does not disagree with the general approach of providing a RAG classification to each site assessment. Stage 2: No explanation is given, however, as to how the significance of potentially harmful impacts is to be assessed in the exercise of planning judgement. More generally, no guidance is provided on how the Factors in Favour and Factors Against are ranked and/or weighted. Without such an explanation it is not clear how the individual, or relative, merits of sites are assessed. This is a weakness given that Step 2 is used to either include or reject sites for allocation.
Q02	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	We object to the assessment of our client's site (207) in the Site Assessment document. As a priority 5 site, the land should fall within the 'potential inclusions' (yellow sites) category. Do not support the Step 2 'refining criteria' and the lack of clarity on how sites have been assessed against the factors listed in the table. Requires more clarity on step 2 assessment.
Q02	Stephen Dunn [6275]	Sworders (Miss Michelle Hill) [6070]	Site selection process appears to be sound to a certain extent. However, step 2 using planning judgement, appears to be too subjective and as such, leads to inexplicable inconsistencies. Paragraph 69 states that there may be some 'exceptional reasons' why certain sites fall into certain categories, however, going through just some of the assessment criteria, the required justifications are not explicit.
Q02	Stoford Developments [6059]	Barton Willmore (Mr Mike Brereton) [5787]	We reiterate our support for the release of land at Damson Parkway from the Green Belt, but strongly suggest that the proposed restriction to JLR related uses and supply chain is removed. This restriction is not required given the scale and nature of the employment land shortfall and the need for flexibility. Therefore, we request that Policy P1 and Site 20 be amended to reflect an unrestricted allocation for Class B1c, B2 and B8 uses at Damson Parkway. Please see attached letter for our full representations.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Basic elements of the Methodology acceptable and workable. Other elements are flawed and over complicated.</p> <p>Non-compliant with Government policy on strong defensible Green Belt boundaries. No reference to creating boundaries in NPPF.</p> <p>Lack of consistency, particularly when comparing sites in the same location.</p> <p>Site assessments incomplete in some instances.</p> <p>Flawed judgements or lack of sound reasons why some sites allocated/rejected /de-allocated.</p> <p>No advantage in creating yellow, blue and subsequently amber sites. This is unnecessary and adds to confusion and complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them as proposed allocations.</p>
Q02	Summix (FHS) Developments Ltd [4455]	Framptons Planning (Mr Greg Mitchell) [2685]	<p>Step 2 process lacks transparency and robustness in way it draws matters for consideration together and balances them in the decision making process, with little explanation.</p> <p>A number of concerns with the way site 313 has been assessed both in terms of the assessment process and judgements made within this document itself, and also the robustness of the evidence base used to underpin it.</p> <p>Methodology is applied incorrectly to Site 313 Fulford Hall Farm and is flawed, as Step 1 priority should be 6 rather than 9, in respect of judgements made on green belt and landscape sensitivity. Accessibility study concludes the site has high accessibility therefore logically should be categorised as 6 and not 9 contrary to SMBC evidence base. In the greenbelt assessment the site is within broad area 1 with all broad areas given a score of 3 (highest rating). This is fundamentally flawed and unsound, lacking the detail of a district level assessment and artificially inflating the contribution of the Fulford Hall Farm to safeguarding of the countryside. In terms of landscape character the site is classified within LCA2 and its visual sensitivity is classified as high. Contest the methodology used to establish visual sensitivity which appears to be weakly justified with no explanation of how the classification criteria have been assessed or judged.</p> <p>11 of proposed site allocations fall under Category 3 in SHELAA and are classed as not currently developable.</p>
Q02	Susan Roberts [5924]		<p>Object to further consultation being undertaken on the Amber sites that the Council have already assessed and rejected. (In particular Amber site ref A7). It potentially gives promoters of these sites a 'way in' which is contrary to the Council's own assessment and conclusions reached.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	Taylor Wimpey [579]	Lichfields (Zoe Simmonds) [5575]	Agree with approach taken by the Council to identify suitable sites for development. It is right to first consider brownfield sites and to then other accessible and sustainable locations, as required by paragraph 138 of NPPF. Agree Step 2 conclusions for Site 122, but not fully with comments on accessibility and landscape. Accessibility comments not consistent with positive findings in Interim SA (January 2017). LCA not fully relevant to Site 122 as it covers much larger area, does not assess specific capacity levels, and includes landscape sensitivities and value not relevant to site.
Q02	Terra Strategic [5698]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	We object to the Q02 in that it has not allowed for sufficient growth for Meriden, a sustainable location which is well located for the HS2 Interchange Station and should have been allocated a higher growth priority than it is currently in the draft plan. We also maintain a fundamental concern over the Q02 because Step 1 of the process is reliant on a flawed Green Belt Assessment report
Q02	Terry Clayson [4147]		Far too many houses being planned for the Blythe area and Shirley is taking the brunt of the allocations. The allocations are not being evenly distributed across the Borough.
Q02	Terry Clayson [4147]		Too many houses planned for Blythe 38% of the boroughs allocation is unfair
Q02	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		The HBF do not comment on the merits or otherwise of individual sites selected for allocation. The Council should also provide maximum flexibility within its overall housing land supply to respond to changing circumstances, to treat the housing requirement as a minimum rather than a maximum and to provide choice and competition in the land market.
Q02	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		The requirement for new housing is a borough-wide problem. The provision of sites required appears to be unfairly balanced against Knowle. This imbalance is purely due to Green Belt land which is considered to be readily available. The increase is disproportionate to the size of the settlement. Suggested that the number of new homes should be based on a more appropriate increase in population numbers such that infrastructure will not become overloaded.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q02	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Basic elements of the Methodology acceptable and workable. Other elements are flawed and over complicated.</p> <p>Non-compliant with Government policy on strong defensible Green Belt boundaries. No reference to creating boundaries in NPPF.</p> <p>Lack of consistency, particularly when comparing sites in the same location.</p> <p>Site assessments incomplete in some instances.</p> <p>Flawed judgements or lack of sound reasons why some sites allocated/rejected /de-allocated.</p> <p>No advantage in creating yellow, blue and subsequently amber sites. This is unnecessary and adds to confusion and complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them as proposed allocations.</p>
Q02	Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss Charlotte Kirby) [2531]		<p>Do not agree. Significant inconsistencies in application which undermine integrity. Sustainability analysis does not meet NPPF requirement, and SA should be reviewed/updated in line with Government scorecard. This would result in red rating for sustainability for Site 4. Sites proposed that are inconsistent with Option G of Spatial Strategy. Not possible to understand how some sites became green when clearly have high impact. SA excludes a number of smaller and Strategy focuses on large green belt releases inconsistent with advice on mix of sites. Smaller sites should be re-assessed as less impact and more deliverable.</p>
Q02	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		<p>No. Local Wildlife Sites and potential Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) have been inconsistently considered in decision making. Some potential LWSs have been assessed by the LWS team against the criteria to inform decision making and some have not. Those that have not should be assumed likely to qualify under the precautionary principle until further survey can be undertaken. LWSs should form a significant constraint to development - currently some sites are included for allocation which would destroy one of these sites of country value to nature conservation.</p>
Q02	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	<p>Strongly object to application of two stage Q02. A more detailed assessment of the step 2 assessment specifically in relation to sites identified within Hampton in Arden clearly indicates that the planning judgement has not been applied consistently, on a like-for-like basis, across sites within a single settlement or that are comparable in character and/or size. Does not object to the methodology but does object to the inconsistency of its application.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Balsall Common			
Q03	Andrea Baker [3471]		Infrastructure plans are incomplete, and barely bring the area to a point of coping with existing residents/influx of school children each day. Primary school over capacity and breaches modern educational and safety standards in every way. Secondary over capacity. Highway infrastructure doesn't cope with existing traffic, with accidents happening in village on a daily basis. Bringing so many additional residents will make the area unlivable without a comprehensive full Community Development Plan that looks at the entire current needs, and then plans for the increase of another 4,000 people, rather than a 'make do and fix' approach as outlined here.
Q03	Andy Wilson [3394]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of road network to ensure growth can be managed, at least until bypass built. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. No ecological assessments published. The only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	Anna Waters [6204]		There is no timing plan. Significant expansion of the village needs careful planning. Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is already full at 4 form entry with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. The Kenilworth Road has long queues at peak times affecting air quality and the health of residents. No ecological assessments have been published. Would urge the Council to seriously look at building a new settlement to the North of Balsall Common as an alternative to imposing significant amounts of housing on the village
Q03	Annie Lutzy [6293]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Arta Golestani [5527]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Balsall Common Primary School (Ms Clare Hinde) [5972]		The Local Governing Board of Balsall Common Primary School (BCPS) do not agree with the proposed infrastructure solution to create a new 2-form entry primary school to meet the demand for new school places. The Board feel the creation of a second 2-form entry primary school is inefficient financially and educationally detrimental. We propose relocating BCPS to a new site enabling the school to become a 5-form entry school. This would better serve the community, be financially beneficial and most importantly allow all children in Balsall Common access to the same outstanding level of education. (Business Plan attached, written in 2016, outlining case for 4 form school. Considered that with proposed development in DLP a 5 form entry school would be needed). Barratts Farm site considered suitable for new build.
Q03	Balsall Common Primary School (Ms Clare Hinde) [5972]		The Local Governing Board of Balsall Common Primary School (BCPS) do not agree with the proposed infrastructure solution to create a new 2-form entry primary school to meet the demand for new school places. The Board feel the creation of a second 2-form entry primary school is inefficient financially and educationally detrimental. We propose relocating BCPS to a new site enabling the school to become a 5-form entry school. This would better serve the community, be financially beneficial and most importantly allow all children in Balsall Common access to the same outstanding level of education.(Business Plan attached, written in 2016, outlining case for 4 form school. Considered that with proposed development in DLP a 5 form entry school would be needed). Barratts Farm site considered suitable for new build.
Q03	Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]		we welcome the much needed infrastructure improvements for Balsall Common, but the proposals are too vague and do not give residents the confidence they will be adopted effectively. The proposed primary school must be built before the housing as the existing school is at breaking point and cannot cope with any more pupils. The by-pass has received mixed response, and appears to be merely an access road for the Barratts farm site. Through traffic must be regulated to ensure its directed on to the by-pass away from the centre of Balsall Common to also enable the Centre to be improved.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		<p>An infrastructure plan is needed to be produced step by step to meet the needs of the population prior to occupation. The emerging Balsall Parish NDP Policies should be considered in relation to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Phasing of housing to reduce combined construction impact with HS2 -Investment in retail, community space and parking -By-pass to relieve congestion on A452 -Additional parking at station -New Primary/Secondary school places -Community and civic provision -Improvements to all transport modes -Expansion of health services to match population -Crime reduction measures -Older persons housing close to centre
Q03	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		<p>Welcome identified infrastructure needs. Additional issues;</p> <p>Infrastructure timing - many facilities at capacity, schools, village centre, station parking, provision for young people. Enhanced provision needs to be in place very early.</p> <p>Public transport - increased rail capacity/frequency, enhanced bus timetables with express services for commuting.</p> <p>Balsall Common centre - welcome proposal for SMBC to lead and involve Parish Councils/Residents Association/Society. Requires significant investment/improved maintenance of public realm.</p> <p>Parking - must find additional parking as given distance to centre, a greater proportion of new residents will use cars. Significant additional parking at station required.</p> <p>Education - 2 new primary schools plus further work on secondary provision.</p> <p>By-pass - case not proven. Through capacity constrained at commuting peak times with low traffic otherwise. No increase in through traffic since by-pass line removed. Concerned that by-pass would create more traffic, be unattractive to through traffic, will cause hardship to some residents and inconvenience others, whilst Kenilworth Road residents aware that living on through route.</p> <p>Provision for youth - inadequate, need for land for multi-purpose sports centre.</p>
Q03	Beth Foster [4057]		<p>The current infrastructure is already under pressure - medical services, schools and roads are under strain and I fail to see how this can be adapted to cater for such proposed growth. Cycle paths are short and end in major roads, in Windmill lane (where I live) there are no footpaths , nor mains sewers or gas - is it realistic to think the village can be transformed to provide all these services to a much larger population when it cannot do so at present.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		No infrastructure improvements have been made over many years and the village is already at capacity. Before further development key facilities need to be fully assessed. Parking, at the station and in the centre, needs improvement. While a by-pass may be welcomed, traffic analysis east/west and north/south needs to be undertaken. Viability (and air-pollution) of a route to the west as well as the east must be considered. There is concern that the route through Barratt's Farm is not a by-pass but a feeder road for housing. The latter might be welcomed to ensure no access from existing residential roads.
Q03	Bill Young [6058]		Significant expansion of the village needs careful planning. Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. The Kenilworth Road has long queues at peak times affecting air quality and the health of residents. No ecological assessments have been published. Would urge the Council to seriously look at building a new settlement to the North of Balsall Common as an alternative to imposing significant amounts of housing on the village
Q03	Bob Harris [5639]		The proposed infrastructure - a bypass, increased car-parking, a new primary school, enhanced village centre - should be provided at an early stage, and not left to the whims of developers
Q03	Bob Harris [5639]		There is a need for such infrastructure, but it should be provided before any significant housing development takes place. Solihull MBC should commit to all the CIL being spent in Balsall Common. The proposed infrastructure - a bypass, increased car-parking, a new primary school, enhanced village centre - should be provided at an early stage, and not left to the whims of developers
Q03	BPA (Kevin Knight) [5342]		Please note there is a buried high pressure fuel pipeline running through this area, and thus the easement (3m each side) needs to be kept protected.
Q03	Burton Green Parish Council (Mr Paul Knight) [2688]		Burton Green Parish Council are primarily concerned with the impact of traffic on Burton Green from housing development. Particular concern about Hob Lane, which is in need of improvement. Proposed by-pass will increase traffic using Hob Lane to access University/Science Park through Burton Green. Infrastructure requirements should include improvements to Hob Lane before new housing built, to avoid putting road users in danger.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Carole Beattie [5601]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Catesby Estates Limited [3038]	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	There is no objection in principle to the identified infrastructure requirements for Balsall Common. The proposed residential development on site allocations at Balsall Common must also be seen as contributors to enhancing the Balsall Common centre. Additional development in the locality will bring additional benefits to the local economy, in turn supporting the retention of local shops and facilities and ensuring the ongoing vitality of the centre.
Q03	Catherine Langton [3384]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of road network to ensure growth can be managed, at least until bypass built. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. No ecological assessments published. The only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	CGA Taylor [4250]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Christopher Read [6267]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Christopher Fellows [6118]		Current proposals for distribution of new housing sites alongside HS2 construction works on east side will make much of Balsall Common's road network difficult to negotiate. With inevitable interruptions by construction traffic, limiting housing to the west and restricting construction access to approach from the north would spare most of settlement from congestion.
Q03	Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	On the basis of these representations, we agree with the infrastructure requirements, in particular the delivery of the By-pass and it is clear that the Barratt's Farm Site has a key role in delivering this element, to the significant benefit of the wider settlement.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Councillor D Bell [2235]		We need infrastructure. Green spaces, sports facilities, parking, improvements to very limited centre.
Q03	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Do not agree with By-Pass. Need solution providing genuine alternatives to car travel, with alternative means to address traffic volumes and speeds whilst enabling access for through traffic. Support enhancements of the centre to raise esteem and create identity. Other barriers to facilitating train travel than car parking alone, such as poor facilities for bike storage. Support additional bus services. Support new primary school, which could contribute to promoting sustainable travel and reducing congestion. Concern over Secondary places and expansion of existing schools. Good access to growth hubs despite being self-contained settlement with little employment.
Q03	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	I agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Balsall Common. In addition I believe it appropriate to make allowance for an area of employment land as part of the village settlement. This would minimise the need for local inhabitants to travel to and from work and make a contribution towards engendering a more complete and balanced community.
Q03	Dave Acford [3857]		I appreciate that there is a shortage of housing, ; however I am very concerned about the numbers proposed in this area and the impact they will have on the local community and the environment. I am concerned that the current facilities in Balsall Common will not cope, particularly the health centre and the village centre. I am worried about what the plan will be for access, particularly into the Barrett's Farm development I am concerned about the disruption to the village, bearing in mind the difficulties that HS2 is going to cause.
Q03	David Langton [3382]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of road network to ensure growth can be managed, at least until bypass built. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. No ecological assessments published. The only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Balsall Common sites Q3 - to Q10 - see detail in letter

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	<p>Objection to scale of development proposed in Balsall Common: 1,700 dwellings to a single rural village appears completely disproportionate. No discussion on how proposed new infrastructure such as school, bypass, station car park and improved public transport will be funded. Bypass would draw trade away from the existing centre. No capacity study carried out for the area. Ability of the market to absorb and deliver multiple sites at any one time in a rural location should be reviewed. Balsall Common will be acutely affected by HS2 - both in terms of the physical construction of the line and the disruption and uncertainty that this will bring; but also in terms of market desirability until such time as the line is constructed. Site 1 in multiple ownerships adding to complexity.</p>
Q03	Debbie Wylde [4546]		<p>No proper thought has been given to how the village will cope with such a massive injection of residents and their motor vehicles into a village with already over loaded and busy roads. Objects to destruction of lovely site which acts as a wonderful peaceful buffer to increasingly busy roads. Site has no sensible and safe access points for the number of vehicles which will be entering and exiting the site. Plans to build on the Catholic Church field and access via Oxhayes Close is irresponsible and unfair on residents of the cul de sac. Road isn't wide enough and along with the sharp bend and the fact that many residents park on the pavements makes this a dangerous and impractical idea.</p>
Q03	Diane Langton [3380]		<p>There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of road network to ensure growth can be managed, at least until bypass built. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. No ecological assessments published. The only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.</p>
Q03	Diane Howell [5567]		<p>Infrastructure needs to be in place before significant building occurs. Much of the housing planned will need to be phased after HS2 as the primary school site can only be developed after HS2. Secondary school capacity needs to be considered, I find it hard to believe that will not need to increase; I don't believe in limiting the secondary school catchment area to Balsall Common: children benefit from diversity at school. Bypass allows more scope for village centre redevelopment. Concern over how soon infrastructure improvements will occur. Village centre, parking and primary school are already under strain without additional development.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Diane Howell [5567]		my concerns relate to how soon improvements in infrastructure will occur, as the village centre, parking and primary school are already under huge strain before any increase in population.
Q03	Dominique McGarry [4414]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Dr Christine West [5726]		The station car park is inadequate. Cars use Hallmeadow Road and Station Road as overflow car parking. There are only two trains an hour; the bus service is very limited in times and destinations and the centre of the village is rapidly declining in variety of shops since all the banks closed. Parking in the village is so bad that almost every week there are small collisions between cars, made worse by the huge delivery lorries which obscure vision. Also, the vans which use the parking outside the shops and where the vehicle projects into the road are another hazard.
Q03	Eileen Lamb [5709]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Ella McGarry [4246]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Ferdous Gossain [5606]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Francoise Read [6268]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Gemma Blanco [4349]		Frog lane should not be included in the development plan as the proposal does not address the infrastructure requirements for Balsall Common and contradicts Paragraph 97 to supports the maintenance of the existing green belt boundary. Issue of Primary care/GP neglected to be included in Infrastructure requirements. Balsall Common doctors and dentists practise already overstretched.
Q03	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Balsall Common will become a major settlement within Solihull Borough. The proposed Green Belt boundary amendments on the eastern side of the village will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation, including infrastructure provision. The lack of employment proposals within Balsall Common will exacerbate the settlements commuter image and fly in the face of sustainability credential Solihull may wish to exhibit.
Q03	Hannelore Lloyd [6260]		There just isn't the infrastructure to absorb the increase in traffic and additional pressure on existing services like the doctors surgery, the post office etc. General and commuter Parking issues.
Q03	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		Para 88 suggests a preferred route for a Balsall Common By-pass. Is the Council able to indicate the route on a map and share any information it has gathered to show the relative impact on landscape character and or the setting of any affected heritage asset; and whether other potential routes may have been considered. Is this new road an element of the Plan you are seeking a response to?
Q03	HS2 (Peter Attwell) [2776]		Site plans within the Solihull LPR Draft Concept Masterplans document present an area that is referred to as 'HS2 safeguarded land' using a purple shading. HS2 Ltd understands from discussions that the extent of the purple shaded area shown reflects land subject to formal safeguarding directions + a buffer which has been applied by the LA. The area indicated as safeguarded is not consistent with that to which the formal safeguarding directions apply. To avoid potential confusion it would be appreciated if future plans indicate the extent of land that is subject to formal safeguarding directions.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Iain Foster [3579]		<p>The infrastructure proposals do not meet the current needs let alone the needs of a significantly increased population if all your proposed houses are built.</p> <p>Need for interconnected cycleways linking Balsall Common to surrounding settlements/workplaces.</p> <p>Risk to pedestrians from roads without pavements.</p> <p>Alignment of by-pass flawed and is re-purposing of existing rather than new infrastructure.</p> <p>Inadequate drainage provision.</p> <p>Primary School is full and new school required before houses built.</p> <p>Public transport is inadequate and requires improving.</p>
Q03	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	<p>It is noted that a new Balsall Common By-pass is required to sustain to the proposed growth within this area. The Council should evidence that this infrastructure will come forward with the development surrounding to ensure that it is in place at the correct time, with the funding required for this in place to allow the correct phasing.</p> <p>Finally, the Council should be sure that HS2 will be forthcoming, and will provide a defensible boundary, as it continues through the Local Plan Review process.</p>
Q03	Izumi Segawa [5872]		<p>Balsall Common town itself is not an attractive place, but to live in Balsall Common is attractive thanks to the surrounding countryside. Building on all available land means that the British countryside is losing to yet more ugly houses.</p> <p>If you look at the town of Balsall Common itself, which is currently quite grotty, there is more opportunity for better development - above/behind shops/unnecessarily large car park by Co-op. Instead of choosing the easy option of building on greenbelt and farmland, you should use more imagination to maximise the use of the existing town.</p>
Q03	Izumi Segawa [5872]		<p>Kenilworth road is a wide road and it's only busy during rush hour. There is no need for building yet another large road. Instead of accommodating the ever increasing amount of cars in this country, local councils and the government have a responsibility to make it easier for people to use fewer cars, travel by public transport and leave as much valuable nature for the next generation. That's at least what we are trying to do and the government is being an obstruction to achieve such a legacy.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Jean Fleming [3444]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of road network to ensure growth can be managed, at least until bypass built. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. No ecological assessments published. The only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	Jean Kelly [5684]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Jeanette McGarry [4247]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No rigorous assessment undertaken to demonstrate need for bypass, or for route, which appears pre-determined. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Kate Riemer [5550]		If development is to be permitted then the infrastructure improvements to the village centre and the construction of the bypass must be completed before development of the Barratt's Farm site is commenced.
Q03	Kate Riemer [5550]		The infrastructure requirements identified apply to the existing settlement of Balsall Common. Any attempt to justify meeting or financing them through the proposed overwhelming scale of development for the village is illogical and unreasonable.
Q03	Kate Riemer [5550]		The Plan correctly identifies the existing significant pressure on the village centre, station parking, traffic and community facilities. This must not be used to justify the proposed scale of development, Green Belt loss, increased population and traffic which would turn the village into a town. Such large scale development must not be permitted without undertaking a full analysis of its impact on the village centre and facilities. If development is to be permitted then the infrastructure improvements to the village centre and the construction of the bypass must be completed before development of the Barratt's Farm site is commenced.
Q03	Ken Bone [5925]		- Your proposals don't take HS2 construction into account, especially where you have allocated even further greenfield development such as areas between Catchem Corner and Hob Lane. - The 'Masterplan' for Balsall Common village centre is dependent on t

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	The infrastructure proposed to support the allocations and expansion of Balsall Common should be contained in an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to supplement the Regulation 19 Submission Plan. In relation to the proposed Balsall Common By-pass from Hall Meadow Road to the A452 at Meer End Road. It will be important to demonstrate that funding is available or the cost of the scheme required will not impact the viability of development proposals.
Q03	Lisa Champion [5325]		There is an active walking community in Balsall Common. Infrastructure plans need to take into account walking routes and existing public footpaths and retain high quality green space. We also require upgraded street lighting.
Q03	Mark Irvine [5717]		The proposed plan appears to take into account come mixed use transport. There is no comment around cycling. The main cycle commute routes between Coventry and Solihull have to cross the A452 at some point. The route of the bypass should take into account the fact that cyclists will need to cross it and facilitate this.
Q03	Matthew Quinn [4344]		There is no master plan for Balsall Common and it is not clear about who will fund the infrastructure. No guarantees that more local trains would be provided. Only two trains per hour at moment. Sporting facilities should be provided by the existing Lant facilities. No clear plans on how bypass would be funded.
Q03	Michael Watkinson [3576]		The southbound station platform (#2) will need improved covered waiting facilities as passenger numbers rise and more people commute to Coventry.
Q03	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Balsall Common will become a major settlement within Solihull Borough. The proposed Green Belt boundary amendments on the eastern side of the village will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation, including infrastructure provision. The lack of employment proposals within Balsall Common will exacerbate the settlements commuter image and fly in the face of sustainability credential Solihull may wish to exhibit.
Q03	Mr & Mrs Dallow [5801]		There are no plans included apart from the bypass. We should protect our country lanes and roads from the burden of articulated lorries and heavy speeding traffic from the village centre. <u>Keep the local lanes free for local residents, pedestrians and cyclists.</u>
Q03	Mr & Mrs Hughes [5467]		There are insufficient facilities for existing residents. Shops and banks have closed, parking issues in the village centre and at Berkswell Station and the medical centre is at saturation point.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. No assessment done of the Highways to ensure the road network can cope, at least until such time that the bypass is built. Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. The only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane. Public transport is inadequate with infrequent bus services and only 2 trains every hour during peak times, so people depend on cars. Ecological Assessments not published
Q03	Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]		There is no objective justification for a bypass using traffic statistics and no rationale for the decision change since December 2013. There has been no significant change in traffic volumes. Providing a bypass will encourage commuter traffic which is currently constrained by the traffic lights at Kelsey Lane. Schools provision looks inadequate given that Balsall Common primary school is beyond a 3-form capacity for 2 year groups. The centre needs radical change to accommodate additional housing. There needs to be a commitment from SMBC to spend CIL money raised to improve the public realm and provide more car parking.
Q03	Mr Andrew Darby [5992]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	Mr Andrew Fox [5816]		I think the amount of houses proposed is unsustainable for the village - upto 200 new houses??! Why all in this village? A "bypass" would be a nightmare as it would run through new houses - not really a bypass - 900 houses, 1800 cars, 2 exits, morning madness. The existing primary has too many pupils - hte existing year 2 has an extra class already, an old art room had to be sacrificed... this will run through all school years... how can the secondary school be expected to take in another primary school?
Q03	Mr Barrie Howarth [6132]		The bypass is poorly thought out. Waste Lane Hodgetts lane duggins lane will become rat runs without for thought of any traffic management to prevent this. The building of new houses with no additional employment opportunities will just mean more commuter traffic as nobody can walk to work. 're public transport why not just build houses near current employment hubs people can then walk to work.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr C Gledhill [4812]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Mr Chris Bradshaw [3359]		Additional matters to be included More frequent bus services to Coventry as well as evening services Bus services to Kenilworth (providing links to Warwick/Leamington also Development of village centre and avoidance of dangerous carparking in front of shops is essential Single carriageway bypass will not be sufficient to deter traffic through village centre. More crossing points and traffic calming along Kenilworth Road required Parking outside/near schools needs to be addressed especially Balsall Street. Holly Lane Park must be retained and developed Development of business/light industry opportunities would support village growth and services.
Q03	Mr Christopher McDermott [3693]		Infrastructure should include the requirement to provide new leisure facilities and to enhance existing sports facilities in the immediate area. There is no mention of the need to expand rail capacity. Peak hour trains already leave people behind at Berkswell station, additional housing will make this problem worse and so it should be mandated that additional capacity is provided at peak times to and from Birmingham and Coventry. Furthermore the village centre cannot cope with additional traffic using Station Road and the shops.
Q03	Mr D Deanshaw [2226]		Medical premises sufficient, but more doctors needed. Primary school expansion/new provision x2 essential to include possible relocation of Balsall Primary to Grange Farm, away from HS2/B4102 traffic. More sporting facilities needed, especially all-weather to meet hockey/football needs, and could be provided at Frog Lane as alternative to housing. By-pass essential to meet JLR/UKC needs and should deter development to east by taking widest possible sweep. Centre not thriving, businesses closing, parking key issue and could be addressed by acquiring Partco to use as multi-storey car park. Site 43 Old Lodge Farm suitable location for an hotel.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr D Edmonds [4808]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Mr D Perks [3399]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Mr David Varley [3385]		Balsall Common not well placed for growth in excess of needs. Public transport not feasible option for most people as services infrequent and do not serve times of day or places needed. Station has inadequate parking. Bypass yet to be justified/evaluated and will result in pollution to households either side. Danger it will just replace 2xroundabouts and 1xlights with 4/5xroundabouts. Proper evaluation of western option would offer better defensible boundary and easier access to north and west. Centre and parking not working for existing population and will need exceptional planning to cope with 1760 houses/3500 cars. New primary school needs building before all houses completed plus parking/bus access required. Health facilities would need increase. Greenspace, recreational areas, cycle paths and walking routes to centre essential.
Q03	Mr Derrick Walker [4780]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr Dominic Mayes [5304]		<p>Access to Elysian Gardens estate and properties on this estate already difficult and this will be compounded if new estate is implemented.</p> <p>Emergency Service response hampered especially to existing and new estates due to traffic levels and difficulty accessing the estate.</p> <p>Balsall Common as a village is already saturated with the centre struggling to cope with the number of vehicles and people. Parking in the centre is dangerous and regularly leads to accidents. Between the busiest hours, traffic in the village comes to a standstill with queues reaching from Sainsburys on Kenilworth road down to the island in the centre and then right the way down past the traffic lights and past the Elysian Gardens development. Current residents are unable to get out of their estates due to through traffic. The existing roads can barely handle the level of traffic when at the busiest times of the day.</p>
Q03	Mr G Wilkinson [4788]		<p>There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.</p>
Q03	Mr G Frost [4809]		<p>Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.</p>
Q03	Mr Gary Lindop [5433]		<p>Construction of a bypass would cause further upheaval for Balsall Common and its residents.</p> <p>The cost of the exercise cannot be justified when there are numerous alternative sites that would require a reduced infrastructure spend.</p> <p>The bypass would promote 'increased' car usage when a 'reduction' is required. If the bypass was used as a new greenbelt boundary this would be seen as a 'thumbs up' to developers for further housing developments to the east of the village. This would permanently destroy the rural character of Hob Lane and Windmill Lane.</p> <p>Existing wildlife habitats would also be destroyed.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]		<p>The proposed bypass will be inadequate to cope with all of the demands. A west side bypass is inevitable and should be built now to move the traffic away from the village.</p> <p>The station parking problems are caused by NEC visitors and Tile Hill overflow; the proposal does not address this.</p> <p>Public transport is and will remain inadequate; the proposal puts forward wishful thinking as a policy.</p> <p>The centre is in decline and requires radical and expensive rebuilding; general 'improvements will be ineffective. All of the CIL money should be spent in the village.</p>
Q03	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		<p>Bypass. No consensus on need. If required eastern route impractical, resulting in air pollution to affordable homes, new primary school and medical centre, congestion at roundabout near station, through traffic using centre. Solution is western route using Honiley Road, Fernhill Lane, new road skirting Grange Farm/Trevallion Stud, funded by developments at Grange Farm/Trevallion Stud, providing better access to JLR.</p> <p>Village Centre. Limited opportunities and would be overwhelmed if housing growth and no improvements.</p> <p>Station parking. Provided by HS2 works.</p>
Q03	Mr Graham Thomas [5361]		<p>The By-pass was taken OUT of previous Plans. Hall Meadow Road is a site access road provided by a housing developer and already has several roundabouts.</p> <p>Any By-pass MUST consider the future provision of the A45/A46 link which has potential of by-passing Balsall Common AND Kenilworth, and actually being attractive to through traffic. Rather than a back road.</p> <p>There is no justification for extending two site access roads to meet the A452, and cutting more Green Belt land out decades before it is needed or agreed for use for more houses not in this Plan period.</p> <p>Village has some range of facilities, but now no Banks, and the health centre, shops and parking/traffic arrangements are not fit for the village which is already twice as big as it was. (para84)</p> <p>The Secondary School will soon be overcrowded too and the Catchment Area will need to be adjusted.</p>
Q03	Mr H Keene [4806]		<p>Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		Plan should avoid adding population in areas without transport infrastructure and local employment. Balsall Common is specifically identified as lacking in local services and employment. No commitment to address the very poor connectivity with the rest of the borough, or plans for new business premises. No actions to improve integration of Balsall Common within borough and regional context. Size of growth disproportionate, unfair and will have severe impacts on community. No justification for extent of development in green belt or for relaxation of normal restrictions. Growth warrants higher share of CIL.
Q03	Mr Henning Kleine [3633]		Hardly any structure/coordination as to how these developments will be erected. The infrastructural requirement to integrate it into the village structure are not considered sufficiently. I stress that the village centre has no chance to cope with this development. Development will take away a recreation area including the benefits for dog-walkers and joggers; it will harm the bio-diversity of the Meriden gap. There is no proper concept as to how the bypass may help the situation in the village unless also Kenilworth Road is completely restructured and be made a non-through road.
Q03	Mr J Stanley [4786]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published
Q03	Mr James Hamilton [6038]		Enhancements to the Village Centre are mentioned in the Plan but a thorough analysis of the impact of new housing on the centre and village as a whole needs to be undertaken to look at the effect of increasing the population of our village by 50% before committing to additional housing. Additional housing (2000 on site 1) will create a huge increase in cars and overwhelming impact on village infrastructure Access points for site 1 should be concentrated on the Bypass to avoid extra congestion in the village centre

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr James Henry [5365]		<p>I would like to see provision for bicycling infrastructure (e.g. Cycle lanes, bike stands in the village centre, more stands at the station).</p> <p>The medical facilities should be expanded to accommodate the bigger patient list.</p> <p>Exercise machines in the parks would be welcome.</p> <p>I am in favour of the planned eastern bypass. Measures should be taken to ensure that the bypass is used rather than Kenilworth Road (e.g. 40 mph speed limit on the bypass etc)</p>
Q03	Mr John Wilson [3890]		<p>There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. No ecological assessments published. The only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane</p>
Q03	Mr Julian Henwood [5411]		<p>I do not believe that Balsall Common requires a by-pass. Even at peak traffic times, traffic along the Kenilworth Road continues to move at close to the speed limited of 30mph. Creating a by-pass will simply create two busy road with no easing of traffic flow.</p> <p>Balsall Common simply does not have the capacity in its village centre or its amenities to deal with the extra population which would be created by such a large development.</p> <p>The parking problems at Berkswell Station can easily be addressed by the construction of a second tier of parking (as has been done at Solihull station), which would put an end to parking on Hallmeadow Road.</p>
Q03	Mr K Hazelwood [6239]		<p>There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.</p>
Q03	Mr K Millican [4779]		<p>There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr Keith Tindall [3020]		<p>While welcoming infrastructure improvements, the proposals are too vague and do not give confidence that they will be adopted and in what form. Many believe a by-pass is necessary, but the concept plan shows it to be simply an access road for the Barratts Farm development, and to be an effective by-pass through traffic must be regulated to ensure it is not permitted to still use the A452 through Balsall Common. This in turn would enable the Centre to be properly enhanced to become a destination of choice.</p> <p>Infrastructure requirements should be implemented before any mass housing development takes place.</p>
Q03	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		<p>Captures main themes and bypass supported, but object as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.No recognition of Berkswell and Balsall Parish NDPs. 2.Underestimates need for fundamental redesign of village centre. 3.Measures will need to be taken to force traffic onto by-pass route. 4.Car parking/school provision need to be adjusted. 5.Trees/hedgerows/wildlife corridors must be retained on Site 1. 6.No vehicular access from Site 1 to Meeting House Lane on safety/congestion/local amenity grounds (pedestrian access is possible). Additional traffic will further isolate new community from existing village. 7. Infrastructure improvements will need to be delivered well in advance of any new build and community benefits retained for settlement.
Q03	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		<p>Whilst the main themes are captured and I support the creation of a bypass</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.There is no recognition of the Berkswell and Balsall Common NDPs. 2.The plan underestimates the need for a fundamental redesign of the village centre.. 3.Measures will need to be taken to force traffic onto the by-pass route 4.There should be no "vehicular access" from the proposed Barratt's Farm development to Meeting House Lane on safety and local amenity grounds (pedestrian access is possible) 4.Plans must reflect the importance of local green belt by retaining trees and hedgerows and preserving green corridors for wildlife,

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr Leigh Mayers [3124]		The proposed 900 houses on Barrett's Farm site is more than previously stated, therefore this latest proposal will have less green space than previously specified. There should be more woodlands and parklands available for the size of the plot
Q03	Mr Leslie Noble [3503]		I object because the level of housing requirement for the village is too high for the level of infrastructure currently in place.
Q03	Mr P Phillips [4798]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	Mr P Greasley [4813]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published
Q03	Mr R A Smith [4782]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published
Q03	Mr Richard Burgess [5518]		Over development is destroying this village
Q03	Mr Richard Burgess [5518]		The construction of a bypass is unnecessary and will simply move the congestion and pollution currently experienced on the Kenilworth Road to the eastern flank of the village and in doing so will destroy green belt land. Over development is destroying this village.
Q03	Mr Richard Chadwick [5964]		The Barratts Lane plan will mean our property (Dragonflies) on Waste Lane becomes surrounded by houses and the new bypass, I therefore ask you INCLUDE our property in the development proposal. This will mean more houses and easier access to Waste Lane.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr Richard Davis [5665]		<p>All development should be phased.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Construct Village car park off Green Lane (Through Gardens) into southern part of Lavendar Hall Park 2 Get the bypass constructed & HS2 3 Allow parking along Kenilworth Road 4 Next the development West of Kenilworth Road 5 Pedestrianize the shop area 6 Make Meeting House Lane single track with passing places 7 Start work on Barretto Lane
Q03	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		<p>If developments on the scale proposed are undertaken it is imperative that infrastructure is in place beforehand. This needs to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Schools as the existing ones are full - New roads if required as well as traffic management and calming to avoid local roads becoming rat runs and/or parking for station - Village centre improvements - Parking in village centre and at station
Q03	Mr Richard Hansell [6034]		<p>My wife and I believe that the plan to build 1,755 new 'more-affordable' homes in Balsall Common and the decline of the older population will lead to a much younger community in the area. We do not think that there is adequate provision in the plan for schools to accommodate the likely increase in children. We also feel that Balsall Common will become a sizeable commuter town and that rather than simply build houses this should be seen as an opportunity to provide better transport, shops and leisure facilities that a vibrant young community will expect.</p>
Q03	Mr Richard Jones [5385]		<p>Whilst I agree with some of the improvement mentioned above such as station parking and improved public transport I fundamentally disagree with the Balsall Common bypass as currently mentioned. The original bypass plan was in the 2006 consultation and was taken out of the plan in 2013 for very good reason. The proposed route for the bypass is out of date and completely inappropriate considering the amount of house building and Hs2 construction work at this moment in time. I think the idea of this out of date bypass will do irreversible damage to Berkswell and Balsall Common.</p>
Q03	Mr Ronald Handfield [3028]		<p>To add another 2000 dwellings in our village, without an increase in secondary schools, medical centres and other amenities is to my mind a travesty of planning. To build any new dwellings without major increases in the road system and parking in the village centre and rail station would be intolerable</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr Ross Collins [5284]		The Bypass for Hall Meadow is unacceptable A. 6/8 Islands will cause more congestion B Environment, This will cause more pollution and a risk to health for all that live on the Riddings estate also endangering the wild life there are deer, pheasants, all kinds of wild birds hence the wild life area at the end of Hall Meadow road C Move the bypass the other side of Kenilworth Road I am sure Gallaghers would be only too pleased to be consulted and there more houses can be built Hall Meadow is also taking the brunt of HS2
Q03	Mr Ross McKinnon [5602]		There is no indication of how the centre can be enhanced or where the land required to do this could come from. The current station parking facilities are inadequate and more housing will increase this pressure, the current plans do not specify the number of additional spaces to be provided. I am unsure how the current secondary school could be expanded to cater for increased numbers given that it is currently surrounded by residential properties and a primary school. Overall the plans seem devoid of details and need much more information to be able to support them
Q03	Mr S C Howles [6237]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	Mr T N Walton [4817]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published
Q03	Mr Tony Mann [5612]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mr William Cairns [3206]		Station parking already problem that will be compounded by new development. Additional parking under viaduct? Lack of employment results in high car usage/ownership and need for ample off road parking/charging points. Concern that traffic assessments incomplete and much traffic locally generated. Eastern bypass merely a collector road, bypass west of settlement required. Concept plan for centre required now. Agree need for new primary school in principle. Need to ensure proportionate share of CIL used in settlement. Misgivings over long term strength of Masterplans and ability to withstand developer pressures. Assumption that settlement prime target for growth needs challenging.
Q03	Mrs E A Seal [4814]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published
Q03	Mrs J Bliss [4803]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published
Q03	Mrs A Hazelwood [6240]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	Mrs Angela Walton [5657]		Historically houses in Balsall Common have commanded a good price and I presume that allowing development here provides a better CIL for SMBC than developments in North of the borough? But the proposed bypass is ill thought out and there is no acceptable firm commitment to provide extra leisure facilities, shopping centre or safe access to shops for both cars and pedestrians. Secondary school expansion should be planned at the same time as housing.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mrs Anya Schofield [5921]		<p>Other key matters of services which have not been considered are a lack of hospital (specifically A&E) to support such an increase in population and lack of supermarket.</p> <p>Instead of increasing the population of Balsall Common by the size of a small village - a new village should be selected (using the lessons learned from the Dickens Heath development) where infrastructure can be developed to the needs of that village. Balsall Common services can never be altered sufficiently to meet the needs of such an increase in population</p>
Q03	Mrs Anya Schofield [5921]		<p>The bypass is not necessary and is a complete aside to the traffic issues in and around Balsall Common. Local routes - specifically the B4101 to Knowle and the road through Hampton in Arden are key routes for those living in Balsall Common. As it is necessary to travel for all work and services (apart from the very basic level of provision in Balsall Common) these routes could not possibly cope with the extra traffic created by the housing proposals regardless of whether a bypass is created.</p>
Q03	Mrs B Badham [5893]		<p>Regarding schooling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HofE and BCPS site to combine to house primary school with properly planned entrance on Gypsy Lane. May still be space for several houses. Suggest secondary school moves to a new site with 6th form centre. <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BCPS remain but reduce to 250 max intake and therefore have two primary school facilities in area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Opposed to 6th Form annexe on current BCPS site. - Suggestion to look at file of complaints in the past concerning problems relating
Q03	Mrs B Stanley [4785]		<p>Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mrs Barbara Hedley [5519]		<p>I am doubtful that a two form entry school is big enough - we need to accommodate children from the NW of the village as well as new residents on Barratts Farm.</p> <p>All road design should focus on improved use for cyclist and pedestrians to minimize traffic and associated pollution, and maximise outdoor activity for all. We need to enhance community spaces, so that as the population grows there are shared facilities for young people, daytime activity groups and necessary core activity to turn a population into a bonded community.</p>
Q03	Mrs C Cavigan [4810]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published
Q03	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		<p>There is no evidence a bypass is needed. However, new sites will require access directly to major roads not minor one.</p> <p>Other improvements need to be in place before development not afterwards</p>
Q03	Mrs Catherine Brown [5731]		I strongly object to the building of a bypass along hallmeadow road. Residents on the Riddings Hill estate already have HS2 on their doorstep - why should they also have to tolerate significantly increased road noise and traffic on their doorstep too? It will devalue homes, increase pollution and noise and is simply unfair. An alternative needs to be considered.
Q03	Mrs Christina O'Sullivan [5373]		<p>I agree with the bypass</p> <p>I agree with the Haul Route</p> <p>I agree with the working party to upgrade the Shops</p> <p>I agree with a new car park at the station</p> <p>I agree with the new primary school.</p> <p>I welcome your intention to set up a "Village Centre Master Plan" to improve our existing village centre</p>
Q03	Mrs Christina O'Sullivan [5373]		I feel you have totally omitted a new doctors surgery. It serves 9000 people at the moment - with extra homes in Balsall Common it will increase the population by half again, which will all need to use the surgery - A big omission not including a new surgery on one of the new housing sites.
Q03	Mrs Debbie Gill [5393]		Surrounding road infrastructure is not suitable - Hob Lane and Waste Lane are country lanes. Countryside should be protected at all cost.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Balsall Common will become unrecognisable if this plan goes ahead.
Q03	Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]		Support redeveloping the village centre and creation of bypass around Barratt's Farm development if allocated. Improved bus/rail service in Balsall Common with more regular and later services and larger car park at station Need for additional school provision, which could be Catholic as the nearest is over 3 miles away. Improved network and signage of public footpaths and walking routes including extension of Kenilworth Greenway more cycle routes Improvements to parking and traffic enforcement. Consider blocking off Lane to through traffic, reducing speed limit. timing of developments after HS2 construction
Q03	Mrs Elspeth Hamilton [5052]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published
Q03	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		No infrastructure improvements have been made over many years and village is already at capacity. Before further development key facilities need to be fully assessed. Bypass. No consensus on need. If required, eastern route will result in congestion at roundabout near station. Solution is western route using Honiley Road, Fernhill Lane, new road skirting Grange Farm/Trevallion Stud, funded by developments at Grange Farm/Trevallion Stud, providing better access to JLR. Village Centre. Concept plans need to be in place and fully costed. Station parking. Provided by HS2.
Q03	Mrs Gillian Tomkys [4787]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane
Q03	Mrs H Brookes [4795]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mrs Helen Goodwin [4636]		Single road as a by pass, but with access off for Barrets Farm, (homes for 900 properties, with potential 1.5 car owners) How can the village have 'enhancements' to the center when there is no scope for any new builds? Station parking would still be a problem, not looking at the parking as it is now. Yes Barretts Farm can walk but not the rest
Q03	Mrs J A Gledhill [4811]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Mrs J A Howles [6236]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	Mrs J Carpenter [4796]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Mrs J E Smith [4781]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Mrs Jennifer K Darby [6284]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]		<p>Main themes captured and support by-pass proposal, but</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.No recognition of the Berkswell/Balsall NDPs. 2.Plan underestimates need for fundamental redesign of the village centre. 3.Measures needed to force traffic onto by-pass route. 4.Have requirements been readjusted for housing increase? 5.Plans must reflect the importance of local green belt by retaining trees/hedgerows and preserving green corridors for wildlife. 6.There should be no vehicular access from proposed Barratt's Farm development to Meeting House Lane on safety/local amenity grounds (pedestrian access is possible). 7.Infrastructure improvements will need to be delivered well in advance of any new build with income retained for settlement.
Q03	Mrs K Drakes [4793]		<p>Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.</p>
Q03	Mrs Karen Hawcutt [3786]		<p>Limit to the number of buildings that an area can take without there being fundamental damage to the environment and quality of life for existing residents.</p> <p>Centre not able to cope with the increase of people or vehicles that new housing has caused. Need a clear vision for enhancing/improvement of centre but plan does not provide this.</p> <p>Parking problems in Station Road, Hall Meadow Road & station</p> <p>Existing road infrastructure insufficient</p> <p>Impact of HS2 construction</p>
Q03	Mrs Kate Cooper [5378]		<p>Balsall desperately needs leisure facilities and increased public transport to Coventry, Solihull and Kenilworth.</p>
Q03	Mrs L Keene [4800]		<p>Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.</p>
Q03	Mrs Leslie Eustace [4792]		<p>Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mrs M Edmonds [4804]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Mrs Maria Morris [3534]		<p>Inadequate reference to parking for the station, currently cars park along route of the proposed bypass and this will grow.</p> <p>There is nothing in the requirement involving sporting options, which falls short of the government obesity strategy of 2018.</p> <p>The plan states improvement in transport links but no guarantee or plan for this</p> <p>I think response times for Police, ambulance and Fire should be considered with such an increase in population</p> <p>There are no plans as to how the village centre may be improved, where we are going to find parking for the increase number of cars in the centre.</p>
Q03	Mrs ML Marsden [5593]		<p>Dismayed to see that 25% of Borough's new housing is in Balsall Common. Relieved to see that SMBC intends and enhance the village centre and infrastructure.</p> <p>Welcome the bypass as the increased number of houses will exacerbate traffic problems. Bypass could enable enhanced entrances to the village along the A452.</p> <p>A new primary school is badly needed</p> <p>The station has been improved but not the parking.</p> <p>Public transport is almost non-existent.</p> <p>Hopeful that plans will include a retirement village style complex in the centre of the village.</p> <p>Need green spaces.</p> <p>Infrastructure should be in place before house building commences.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mrs Moya Melville [5948]		The proposed huge expansion of Balsall Common brings with it an urgent requirement for infrastructure able to support the increased population, traffic, educational and medical needs. Another 3-entry primary school is needed to accommodate new families plus pupils from that side of the village currently at BCPS to address the worsening traffic congestion around the current school. Much better public transport is needed, plus adequate parking for the station. It is vital that the surrounding green belt is not lost to inappropriate soulless development and that the village centre becomes a more attractive destination for shopping, leisure and services.
Q03	Mrs P Green [4790]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published
Q03	Mrs Pam Marsden [4802]		We will have to appreciate future residential development for our area is inevitable but not to the extent of approx. 1800 homes. The surrounding infrastructure and present village facilities are pushed to the limit, dangerous as far as roads and lanes are concerned. HS2 will only add to the problem.
Q03	Mrs Rita Perks [4805]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Mrs Sharon Lindop [6163]		<p>Construction of a bypass would cause further upheaval for Balsall Common and its residents with massive upheaval already from HS2.</p> <p>The cost of the exercise cannot be justified when there are numerous alternative sites that would require a reduced infrastructure spend.</p> <p>The bypass would promote 'increased' car usage when a 'reduction' is required.</p> <p>If the bypass was used as a new greenbelt boundary this would be seen as a 'thumbs up' to developers for further housing developments to the east of the village. This would permanently destroy the rural character of Hob Lane and Windmill Lane.</p> <p>Significant improvements to the nearby A46 have now commenced which are likely to negate the need for a bypass. Phase 3 of the improvements incorporating the proposed link road from the A46 to the A452 is likely to deliver a much better traffic relief solution for Balsall Common and Kenilworth than the proposed expensive bypass by downgrading the A452 through Kenilworth and Balsall Common town and the village centres respectively.</p> <p>Existing wildlife habitats would also be destroyed.</p> <p>The bypass will cause irreversible damage to our countryside and destroy the unique character of Berkswell and Balsall Common for its residents.</p>
Q03	Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]		<p>Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.</p>
Q03	Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]		<p>There is no plan in terms of timing. The infrastructure needed would need to be phased alongside the housing sites and HS2. Lack of detailed highways assessment, published ecological assessment, and phasing plan to manage scale of growth alongside HS2 and ensure provision of schools, shops and by-pass. Does not meet criteria for high frequency public transport so accessibility assessment incorrect. Primary school is 4 form entry not 3, and 20% of SHELAA assessments incorrect.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Ms Anne Stewart [5464]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Ms Jennifer Cayley [5598]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Ms Joanne Bellamy [5599]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Ms Kat Mann [5614]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Ms Natalie Moss [5314]		I support the development but do not support the developer proposal of gaining access through the existing Elysian Garden development. Its already very busy and hard to get out onto the Kenilworth road. The access would also go along the front of my house (No 43) which was not identified as potential development when I purchased.
Q03	Ms Natalie Moss [5314]		Protect the green belt at all cost. Stop abuse of the local housing association property and consder development of sports facilities
Q03	Ms Wendy Gault [6134]		The infrastructure needs identified are good but do not take into account that due to the maximum capacity currently experienced in the primary school, village centre (at peak times), roads and car parking the infrastructure needs will have to be addressed up front to meet the required needs. There are major issues with some areas of infrastructure e.g. rail services
Q03	N Birtley [4453]		Any expansion of thye village would need cobdsiderable improvement to all services, difficultto see how this is cacievable in nconfines of existing centre.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	N Birtley [4453]		<p>Hard to see how the current village centre could be redeveloped within its current boundaries to provide sufficient facilities , retail, leisure, medical, traffic pressure,utilities, parking etc. to meet needs of a vastly increased population.</p> <p>The frequently mentioned concept of a totally new village / settlement with dedicated services seems much more sensible.</p>
Q03	Natural England (Ms Hazel McDowall) [6137]		<p>Natural England encourages the provision of green infrastructure to be included as a specific infrastructure requirement, for example biodiversity, green space, flood risk, climate change, reflecting the multifunctional benefits of green infrastructure.</p> <p>Green infrastructure refers to the living network of green spaces, water and other environmental features in both urban and rural areas. It is often used in an urban context to provide multiple benefits including space for recreation, access to nature, flood storage and urban cooling to support climate change mitigation, food production, wildlife habitats and health & well-being improvements provided by trees, rights of way, parks, gardens, road verges, allotments, cemeteries, woodlands, rivers and wetlands.</p> <p>Green infrastructure is also relevant in a rural context, where it might additionally refer to the use of farmland, woodland, wetlands or other natural features to provide services such as flood protection, carbon storage or water purification.</p> <p>A strategic approach for green infrastructure is required to ensure its protection and enhancement, as outlined in para 171 of the NPPF. We encourage the provision of green infrastructure to be included as a specific infrastructure requirement, for example biodiversity, green space, flood risk, climate change, reflecting the multifunctional benefits of green infrastructure.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Open Spaces Society (Mr Richard Lloyd) [5451]		<p>Master plan approach is welcomed, but should be extended to all part of the Borough. the master plans need to become more tightly defined during the further development of the Local Plan. Should show how the policies elsewhere in the Local Plan are to be implemented in each specific site. Should be clear allocation and protection of areas for public access, should be secured in perpetuity by the dedication of the land as a Village Green, or by dedication of access rights under section 16 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. There is no mention in the Draft Plan of the designation of Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF para 99.</p> <p>In terms of green belt enhancements Potential improvements should be seen in the context of the agricultural use of much of the land, and of the prevailing Solihull Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2016 (ROWIP). Best possible standards and practice should be applied for the physical state of the path network. Registration of unrecorded access rights should be encouraged and expedited. The Local Plan should also define how funding derived from developers will be applied to the other aspects of enhancements to the Green Belt.</p>
Q03	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		<p>- Proposals for residential sites (1,2,3,21,22,23) in Balsall Common are all in Green Belt. 1,690 additional homes would increase existing population (census 2011) by more than 57%.</p> <p>- State funding for a new primary school and expansion of Heart of Enal</p>
Q03	Peter Brett Associates LLP (Tim Coleby) [6198]		<p>We agree, subject to the following:</p> <p>*there being robust evidence to justify that the requirements conform with the CIL Regulations,</p> <p>*in respect of the Balsall Common By-pass (paragraph 88, page 22), confirmation is needed that the route will follow the line previously identified (in the 2006 Unitary Development Plan and later documents including the West Midlands Local Transport Plan 2011-2026). This route is also shown on the Council's Emerging Concept Masterplan for Site 1 Barrett's Farm and our attached Vision Document indicates where the by-pass would run to the east of the land that is currently within Barwood Land's control</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Professor David Walton [3795]		<p>Plan involves a massive expansion into a small town. Can schools cope with increased pupils/sporting facilities/adult education/access for pupils and parents? When will any new school actually be built? A dual-carriageway bypass to west of Balsall Common would take North-South traffic, including traffic from JLR/NEC/Airport, while Hall Meadow could remain an access road for shorter-distance traffic on Eastern side. Will improved car parking be in place before cars pour from new housing onto the local roads? Inadequate/infrequent bus services, train services full, HS2 will require car journeys northwards. Improved security required. Local centre/medical services/power/water supply require improvements.</p>
Q03	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Broadly speaking yes. As noted in our response to question 7, we consider that the identified capacity of the allocation for site 21 of 100 dwellings is significantly underestimated and as such the increase in housing on this site should be considered by the Council in terms of the phasing of infrastructure required. Our Client's land is available now and can provide proportionate contributions to infrastructure early in the Plan period, as required.</p>
Q03	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Balsall Common is identified as suitable for significant expansion and there are several allocations for large-scale housing growth here, alongside other sites which are not allocated but will be released from the Green Belt, meaning additional housing is likely to come forward beyond the numbers allocated. We support the growth of Balsall Common given it is a sustainable location. However, there is clearly a serious disconnect between the level of housing and employment growth proposed. Despite the acknowledgement in the plan that the village does not have significant employment uses the requirements for the area do not list employment. It is not clear how the Council propose to address this significant issue, which will only serve to exacerbate out-commuting and the associated environmental issues. HS2 presents an excellent opportunity to deliver employment land in this location. The upgraded Park Lane and the new roundabout with the A452 would provide a suitable access to our Client's site, and the proposed bypass to the east of the village will avoid through traffic. Include reference to Class B employment as a requirement for Balsall Common and identify our Client's site (Land at Park Lane, Balsall Common) as a suitable location for employment.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, such as Site 1. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q03	Rebecca Clare [3956]		There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of road network to ensure growth can be managed, at least until bypass built. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. No ecological assessments published. The only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane.
Q03	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Before proceeding to allocate housing sites the LPA should look more widely at the individual settlement, how it functions and what problems currently exist. It is important to appreciate the extent of construction work taking place with HS2 as well as proposed by pass and A46 /A452 link road. Local Plan ignores sites on the western side of the village such as Grange Farm and smaller sites between A452 and Balsall Street East which could provide a southern / western link road. There would be pressure on the two primary schools. There is no additional provision for employment land and therefore no work opportunities in the community. Business development could be allocated along the side of HS2 and By Pass as well as sites outside the village such as New Mercote Farm. Provision should be made on one of the larger sites for a large food based store together with other shops, facilities and parking.
Q03	Richard Lloyd [2616]		Proposed bypass on wrong side and longer than necessary, design inadequate to attract through traffic. Major expansion and redevelopment of centre required. NO evidence to suggest train services can be improved without very substantial expenditure. Proposed Primary school inadequate for number of new homes. No land for expansion of Secondary school and undesirable to reduce catchment.
Q03	Richard Onions [4280]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Roderick Hatton [5809]		Bypass should become the route for through traffic. Local traffic only along Kenilworth Road and improved pedestrian facilities. Larger village with more facilities required. Earlier build should be on the Western side of the village whilst HS2 is under construction. A line for a Western bypass should be established. New development should be of high aesthetic value, giving Balsall Common a special character.
Q03	Roger Howles [6238]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q03	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Balsall Common will become a major settlement within Solihull Borough. The proposed Green Belt boundary amendments on the eastern side of the village will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation, including infrastructure provision. The lack of employment proposals within Balsall Common will exacerbate the settlements commuter image and fly in the face of sustainability credential Solihull may wish to exhibit.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Severn Trent Water (Elaine Ring) [6241]		<p>Severn Trent Water response: Results of our high level sewer capacity assessment highlights some possible risks of the proposed development on the sewerage and surface water network. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead.</p> <p>High impact sites in Balsall Common: - Field Between Waste Lane and Old Waste Lane - Frog Lane - Pheasant Oak Farm - Barretts Farm - Windmill Lane - Kenilworth Road</p> <p>Medium Impact Sites in Balsall Common: - Trevallion Stud</p>
Q03	Sheila Cooper [2560]		<p>Plan has not appropriately understood level of infrastructure neglect within the areas of Berkswell and Balsall Common. Should improve rail/bus services, village centre, parking at centre/station, and increase education places with 2 new primaries and additional secondary places.</p> <p>By-pass not justified, Hall Meadow Road is inappropriate and will result in traffic diverting through settlement and impact health/well-being/safety of residents. Compounded by HS2 use. Need to investigate alternative options for viable by-pass and proposes alternative route to west via Fen End Road/Honiley Road taking account of JLR facility</p>
Q03	Simon Clare [3953]		<p>There is no timing plan. The primary school is already full at 4 form-entry. Public transport is inadequate. No assessment of road network to ensure growth can be managed, at least until bypass built. The Kenilworth Road, in particular, has long queues of traffic at peak times. No ecological assessments published. the only additional access point onto the road network will be onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane</p>
Q03	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	<p>In order to meet these ambitious infrastructure requirements in the local area, it will be necessary to allocate additional sites for development within Balsall Common, for example Land at Meeting House Lane and Waste Lane, adjacent to Barratts Farm (part of site 102), Oakes Farm (site 304) and Land at Old Waste Lane/ Waste Lane (part of site 101).</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Balsall Common will become a major settlement within Solihull Borough. The proposed Green Belt boundary amendments on the eastern side of the village will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation, including infrastructure provision. The lack of employment proposals within Balsall Common will exacerbate the settlements commuter image and fly in the face of sustainability credential Solihull may wish to exhibit.
Q03	Sylvia Walton [6203]		<p>Significant expansion of the village needs careful planning. Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with a 4 form entry with no further capacity until a new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. The Kenilworth Road has long queues at peak times affecting air quality and the health of residents. No ecological assessments have been published.</p> <p>Would urge the Council to seriously look at building a new settlement to the North of Balsall Common as an alternative to imposing significant amounts of housing on the village</p> <p>Road access is unsuitable either onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane or through Meer Stones Road estate - this is already turning into a rat run.</p>
Q03	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Balsall Common will become a major settlement within Solihull Borough. The proposed Green Belt boundary amendments on the eastern side of the village will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation, including infrastructure provision. The lack of employment proposals within Balsall Common will exacerbate the settlements commuter image and fly in the face of sustainability credential Solihull may wish to exhibit.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	The Ramblers, warwickshire Area (Mr Michael Bird) [3483]		Warwickshire Ramblers are deeply concerned about the proposed By-Pass, which is part of a far wider damaging scheme for a proposed A46/A452 Link Road from Balsall Common to the Stoneleigh Interchange on the A46; with a possible link to A45 from Burton Green. The wider route would sever some 15 or so rights of way in the Borough. The by-pass is close to the HS2 line and would impact on environmental mitigations already hard won from HS2 Ltd and the Kenilworth Greenway. At grade pedestrian crossings would be extremely hazardous and SMBC ROW Improvement Plan provides no protection for pedestrians.
Q03	Turley (Mr Neil Denison) [3477]	Turley (Mr Neil Denison) [3477]	The aim of providing an enhanced centre for Balsall Common is noted. However, there are significant constraints operating to limit the extent to which the centre or its immediate environs can accommodate any more than a very modest scale of additional development. The scale of new development planned at Balsall Common is likely to give rise to new investment interest from retail operators whose requirements cannot reasonably be accommodated within or on the edge of the existing centre. Therefore relevant policies should be sufficiently flexible to enable such development to be properly assessed.
Q03	Warwickshire County Council (Jasbir Kaur) [5732]		We would welcome the opportunity to work with Solihull MBC to understand the implications of this proposal for traffic in the A452 and A4177 corridors generally, but specifically within Kenilworth town centre and on the section of the A452 between Kenilworth and the County boundary The County Council would also welcome a continued dialogue with Solihull MBC regarding potential longer term strategic road and rail initiatives in this area to ensure these opportunities are not lost as a result of wider decision making within the planning system.
Q03	Wendy Cairns [4226]		Proposed bypass merely moves existing congestion 500 metres to east of village a true bypass would be to the west. Village centre difficult to improve without major demolition and needs more parking needs a concept plan now not in 5 years. agree more parking needed now. Needs more local trains and buses but unlikely to be sustainable here cars will remain main form of transport. Schools will only cope if non borough pupils are excluded. Solihull needs to spend some of the CIL in Balsall Common. Concept masterplans great idea but longevity and ability to resist modification is suspect

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q03	West Midlands Police (Chief Constable) [5044]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The absence of positive references to the need to provide Police infrastructure undermines the delivery of safe and secure development. There should be express reference to the need for financial contributions towards additional expenditure burden placed on WM Police as a consequence of the proposed growth. Seek engagement in preparation of Concept Masterplans and policy implementation and delivery once Plan adopted.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Balsall Common			
Q04	Andrea Baker [3471]		Support consideration of this site, but not the plans for use. Current train services inadequate, and do not serve variety of areas people will need for work. Road network is poor, with insufficient parking at station, speeding traffic making walking dangerous. Proposal needs a rethink based on what the village as a whole needs, not just more houses and no consideration for the people that do, and will, live here. Relocate the schools to purpose built sites to avoid school run chaos, with primary school site for infants/nursery, use secondary site for housing or dedicated community facility.
Q04	Andrew King [2922]		Too much Meriden Gap greenbelt being developed. I agree housing is required but not this much. Needs to be phased, and no building until HS2 is complete. Balsall Common is taking on an unreasonable amount of housing compared to the rest of the borough. It's simply not fair and the village can't cope. Traffic is horrendous at the best of times so with this many extra houses and people, the village will be a constant traffic jam. Barratts Lane needs to be built in keeping with the village and it's rural setting and not let developers build however they like.
Q04	Archdiocese of Birmingham (Rev Paul O'Connor) [3184]		Support, as most appropriate site for strategic growth in area and appreciate that Plan recognises housing is most effective use of land adjacent Catholic Church, Meeting House Lane. Site will provide retirement accommodation to serve needs of Borough residents. Welcome progress on Concept Masterplan and urge completion. As landowner, committed to working collaboratively to deliver. As small part of site contributions need to be proportionate and apply to demands on infrastructure, eg not norm to contribute to educational provision. Density should be considered in context of design, setting and need for accommodation. Site is self-contained and surrounding built form should not be strong influence.
Q04	Balsall Common Primary School (Ms Clare Hinde) [5972]		The Local Governing Body of Balsall Common Primary School (BCPS) believes as per our representation in Question 3 regarding infrastructure requirements for Balsall Common, would be sufficient to accommodate a 5 form, multi-story primary. The proposal from the Leadership Team at BCPS is to build up, rather than out retaining the same footprint as a 2-form entry school. This would further enhance the sound and visual barrier against HS2.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		<p>Site selection criteria not applied correctly as large part is higher performing within BA4 in GBA and should be priority 7 (not 5) in Step 1, unlikely allocation. Will reduce gap between Balsall Common and Burton Green/Coventry already compromised by National Grid site and line of HS2. Likely that Site 1 performs better than GBA RP51 to north-west of settlement. Would contravene purposes of green belt.</p> <p>Concept masterplan</p> <p>Support medium density closer to existing homes, inclusion of public green space/identification of ecological areas. However, ignores/contrary to emerging NDP as fails to locate green space between existing and new housing, proposes access from existing residential roads when not required, flood plain should not be included as green space as not accessible for much of year, and increase in site area not reflected in capacity.</p> <p>Unclear why corridor adjacent HS2 excluded from masterplan as paragraph 103 indicates Barratt's Farm to be phased later in Plan period. Should be medium/high density as building to BS standards will ensure noise levels within WHO guidelines.</p>
Q04	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		<p>There are better alternatives to releasing such a large area from Green Belt in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap. Will not be available until HS2 is complete.</p> <p>Concept Master Plans are welcomed but we've major concerns that, over the long term, pressure from multiple landowners/developers will result in significant changes to the detriment of both new and existing residents.</p> <p>No notice has been taken of Berkswell's NDP especially regarding the concept plan. This states no access to new development off residential roads (MHL, Oxhayes Close, Barretts Lane) and requires open public spaces between existing and new settlements.</p>
Q04	Bob Harris [5639]		<p>The proposed development on this site contains far too much housing. It should be reduced and more open space included.</p>
Q04	Bob Harris [5639]		<p>The scale of development is unacceptable. There should be much less housing and much more open space. Access should be only from the proposed bypass and not Meeting House Lane or other existing residential roads.</p> <p>Infrastructure should be provided at an early stage; not left to whims of developers.</p> <p>Additional consideration should be given to sports facilities for increased population. Location should take account of existing sports facilities. The site to the south of the Blessed Robert Grissold Catholic Church should remain as an open space for sporting activity.</p> <p>Concept Masterplan should be mandatory, not left to planning application stage.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	BPA (Kevin Knight) [5342]		This land interacts with the buried high pressure pipeline in this location, and the easement (3m each side) needs to be protected.
Q04	Burton Green Parish Council (Mr Paul Knight) [2688]		Burton Green Parish Council recognises the difficulties Solihull faces in meeting its housing targets but is disappointed that the development at Barrett's Farm is such a large development of 900 houses. However, the Council is pleased that you have decided to phase this development later.
Q04	Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	<p>The Barratt's Farm site should be included as an allocated site for all the reasons set out in these representations. It is essential to the future sustainable growth and development of Balsall Common and can contribute significantly to the needs of the settlement going forward.</p> <p>The settlement is a sustainable location and the site relates well to the settlement, in accordance with NPPF 138. The settlement needs an appropriate quantum of growth to meet its future needs and maintain the existing services by virtue of additional population.</p> <p>The development will not adversely impact upon the setting and special character of Balsall Common as a historic town or settlement as set out in the Green Belt</p>
Q04	Councillor D Bell [2235]		Barretts farm is a suitable site if the design, green spaces and the and concept plans are agreed.
Q04	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>Subject to addressing flooding concerns. Areas at risk in northern part of site, whilst concept masterplan shows minimal sustainable drainage system. Requires permeable surface treatments, rigorous application of SuDS and Flood Management plans.</p> <p>HS2 brings benefits in form of defensible boundary and potential for higher densities, but should have impact mitigated using opportunities provided by development</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>Barratt's Farm should NOT be included as an allocated site. The land is an extensive area of farmed countryside which performs a key role in the Meriden Gap. Development of Barratt's Farm would reduce the separation between Balsall Common and the edge of the Coventry built-up area, which is Burton Green, from 2 km to just over 1km. The remaining open land is degraded to an extent by the National Grid switching station, and the row of houses on Waste Lane, whilst nominally within Green Belt, bridges a significant proportion of the Green Gap not occupied by the National Grid site. HS2 if built will then effectively remove the remaining open landscape between Balsall Common and Burton Green.</p> <p>It is likely that Barratt's Farm on average performs better than site RP51. This is a large tract of land having a Green Belt score of 7.</p> <p>Draft Concept Plan: Detailed comments on the Concept Plan for Site 1 have been submitted by local people and Parish Councils. We support the general points that they are making</p>
Q04	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>Object to inclusion of Barratts Farm. Plays key role in Meriden Gap, would reduce separation with Coventry and Burton Green. HS2 if built will effectively remove the Green Belt between Balsall Common and Burton Green. <i>Area should perform more highly in Green Belt Assessment</i></p>
Q04	D A Walker [4740]		<p>Objection to building on good farm land and green belt, and to almost doubling in size of development. If the proposed development were to go ahead all access must be from the new bypass leaving the character of Meeting House Lane as it is.</p>
Q04	Dave Acford [3857]		<p>Concerned about access into the Barrett's Farm development. There has long been a proposal for a through road from Hall Meadow Road and that would seem to be the best and safest option for the access to this site. Other proposals to provide access via Meeting House Lane would not be safe or viable. There is no opportunity for pavements and it is already very narrow. Added to this, Meeting House Lane is also very beautiful and it would be a shame for the village to lose it's character.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Debbie Wylde [4546]		<p>Destruction of a lovely site that acts as a wonderful peaceful buffer to the increasingly busy bustle of the roads around the village.</p> <p>Site has no sensible and safe access points for the number of vehicles which will be entering and exiting the site.</p> <p>Development on the Catholic Church field with access via Oxhayes Close is irresponsible and unfair to residents.</p> <p>No proper thought given to how the village will cope with such a massive injection of residents and their vehicles into a village with already over loaded and busy roads.</p>
Q04	Diane Howell [5567]		<p>But it must be developed after HS2 construction and there should be no access from the development onto meeting house lane, barretts lane or oxhayes close. These are narrow residential roads; much of Meeting House Lane has no pavement. Bypass must be single carriageway so that it cannot be used as an extension of any other link road in future</p>
Q04	Dr Christine West [5726]		<p>Proposals for Balsall Common are too highly weighted on this site. Development would increase in traffic and pollution. Loss of footpaths would risk mental health.</p> <p>Some building could take place but not to extent proposed.</p> <p>Housing should be restricted to fields with no footpaths.</p> <p>New school should be given a playing field for wider community use.</p> <p>Good examples from elsewhere in the village should be followed.</p> <p>No building until HS2 and new access road parallel with the Greenway completed.</p> <p>No access from surrounding residential roads.</p>
Q04	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		<p>An ordinary watercourse flows through the site, however our 'Flood Map for Planning' only shows the flood risk from watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km², mapping of the risk from the watercourse has not been undertaken and as such this is the only reason the site is shown to lie in low risk Flood Zone 1. The assessment of flood risk and easement from the ordinary watercourse should be agreed with the LLFA, however we strongly recommend that hydraulic modelling of the watercourse is undertaken as part of a Level 2 SFRA to inform of the developable area and capacity of this potential allocation. Regardless of flood risk, we recommend an unobstructed green corridor is maintained along the banks of the watercourse for the purposes of protecting and maintaining green and blue infrastructure.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is particularly relevant to Site 1. No certainty over the provision of HS2 and the Balsall Common By-pass and as such there are doubts over the provision of a firm eastern Green Belt boundary, without which, as acknowledged in the site assessment that the site would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary. Some of the site is within the highest performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment but not referenced in the site assessment.
Q04	Greenlight Developments (Philip Rawle) [3908]		Support allocation in principle. Concept masterplans: Objects to identification of western part of Site 1 r/o Meeting House Lane as "area of significant ecological value" as misguided. Clear that this neglected grassland does not comprise a species compliment which would enable a classification as species rich or of existing high ecological value (see attached ecology report). Support Pegasus Masterplan which shows land as developable with access off Meeting House Lane and should be used by SMBC. Greenlight is collaborating with majority landowner and site could deliver c60 dwellings or care village of c150 with independent access off Meeting House Lane.
Q04	Greig File [6082]		This seems like a sensible way to extend the village in a controlled manner and in an area that is close to central amenities
Q04	Hannelore Lloyd [6260]		Detrimental effect on the existing houses near the new estate and would mean a huge increase in the number of vehicles on the road with resulting pollution. the proposed new housing development would almost double the size of the village and this combined with the construction of HS2 and the proposed bypass would change the character of the village.
Q04	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		A Heritage Impact Assessment of this proposed allocation has been commissioned by the Council. This evidence will provide consideration of the site's suitability in principle and, without prejudice, an appropriate design response to satisfy national policy and legislation in relation to the historic environment and the delivery of sustainable development. Acknowledge the merit of the SMBC Draft Concept Masterplanning exercise and how the Council considers potential future development might respond to the affected heritage assets. Note that the Council considers there are shortcomings with the Developers Proposal and we attach limited weight to this as a potential acceptable suggestion.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	HS2 (Peter Attwell) [2776]		<p>High level references are made to the arrival of HS2 in the Borough and as such there are no immediate concerns in 'soundness' terms from a safeguarding planning perspective. Concept Masterplans should indicate extent of land that is subject to formal safeguarding directions.</p> <p>HS2 Ltd welcomes the addition of text recognising the need to phase the delivery of the site until later in the plan-period so as to avoid conflict with HS2.</p>
Q04	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	<p>It is noted that there are 'multiple and complex land assembly' issues as Barratt's Farm. The Council should evidence that the Site is deliverable, available and achievable, and the timeframe for this delivery. This will ensure that any proposed housing trajectory will be accurate and achievable</p>
Q04	Izumi Segawa [5872]		<p>Balsall Common town itself is not an attractive place, but to live in Balsall Common is attractive thanks to the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Building on all available land means that the British countryside is losing to yet more ugly houses. So many years down the line, what kind of quality of life is the next generation going to have?</p> <p>There is more opportunity for (better) development in town centre. There is a need for more accommodation but building hundreds of individual houses sounds very inefficient. If you need to tackle the housing deficiency, build more flats in the town centre</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	John Haynes [5927]		<p>Green Belt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposals put the Meriden Gap under threat and do not enhance the Green Belt (as stated in paragraph 96). - Barratt's Farm is at the narrowest point of the Meriden Gap so instead of this development the council should consider building on site numbers 76 and 212 at Cornets End Lane (section 15 and Paragraph 405). <p>Green Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No mention of emerging Berkswell Neighbourhood Plan - If site is developed a tract of open space should run through it. <p>Protection of Property/Quality of Life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SMBC must ensure minimum disruption to existing residents and proposed development should be located away from existing housing - Existing roads insufficient to cope. Meeting House Lane must not become an access point for first phase before HS2 completed. - Development of 2 fields behind catholic church should not be allowed as they are used by the community - No access via Oxhayes Close to be allowed - too restricted already. <p>Concept Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Note that no development should take place until HS2 completed. Main access should be from Station Road and Waste Lane. <p>General Comments</p> <p>What is the justification for choosing Balsall Common for much of Solihull's housing needs?</p> <p>Proposals will increase population of Balsall Common by 50%. Pressure on services</p>
Q04	Kate Riemer [5550]		<p>Masterplan is inadequate and insufficiently developed. It should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Ensure the rural aspect of the land is maintained and preserved. -Include a strengthened version of Para 103 preventing piecemeal development taking place before completion of HS2 -Exclude development of Site 169, which is a long established and valuable recreational space. -Exclude development of Site 30 because of its ecological, landscape and historical importance. -Exclude Meeting House Lane as an access point to any new developments. <p>Essential that development preserves the existing recreational space and significant footpath network.</p> <p>Should adhere to the findings of the Solihull Borough Landscape Character Assessment (Dec 2016).</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Kate Riemer [5550]		<p>Site is vital in preserving the Meriden Gap and the significant heritage, landscape and ecological assets. The Green Belt Assessment is flawed. Site 1 extends into Broad Area 4 which performs highly. Refer to Berkswell Parish Council response to Draft Local Plan (p33-34) on Green Belt score.</p> <p>Include all proposed adjoining sites to prevent piecemeal development ahead of HS2.</p> <p>No development until HS2 is completed.</p> <p>Rural aspect of the land should be maintained and preserved by retaining established trees and hedgerows. Green space should be shown between existing and new development.</p> <p>Oppose local access points onto Meeting House Lane.</p>
Q04	Kate Riemer [5550]		<p>The plan is insufficiently developed. It must be strengthened to cover the whole site by including all proposed small adjoining sites and to prevent inappropriate piecemeal development ahead of HS2 completion. There should be no development until HS2 is completed.</p> <p>It must ensure the rural aspect of the land is maintained and preserved by retaining established trees and hedgerows and green space is clearly shown between existing and new development.</p> <p>We strongly oppose the consideration of local access points onto Meeting House Lane p.15 either for construction work or new housing. This traditional lane is entirely unsuitable for additional traffic</p>
Q04	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	<p>To summarise our position, the land at Barratt's Farm performs a more important role in terms of Green Belt function than at Grange Farm.</p> <p>Site selection step 1- We consider, given our comments above and detailed analysis provided at Appendix 2, that whilst Barratt's Farm has been categorised as a 'yellow' site it should more appropriately have been defined as a 'blue site 6' and that Grange Farm, in contrast should have been categorised as a 'yellow site 5'.</p> <p>Our review of the SA report in January 2017 indicates that Grange Farm would have less significant effects than Barratt's Farm</p>
Q04	Matthew Quinn [4344]		<p>Any construction should be done after HS2 to minimise disruption and provide potentially better access</p> <p>Village centre needs major overall. Money from Development will go to Berkswell Parish and not Balsall Common so will not improve village centre.</p> <p>Solihull have ignored the Berkswell NDP in their plans so are they considering the existing residents?</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Matthew Quinn [4344]		<p>There are no clear access routes. Oxhayes Close, Barratt's Lane and Meeting House Lane would be unsuitable for access.</p> <p>There should be a clear green space between existing and new developments as per The Grovefield Estate.</p> <p>Village centre needs major overall. Money from Development will go to Berkswell Parish and not Balsall Common so will not improve village centre.</p> <p>Solihull have ignored the Berkswell NDP in their plans so are they considering the existing residents?</p> <p>There are several oak trees all with TPOs .</p>
Q04	Michael Watkinson [3576]		<p>I think it important that a green strip is maintained between existing housing on Meeting House Lane and the new Barratt's farm development, similar to the gap/park between Riddings Hill Estate and the older housing to the west of it.</p>
Q04	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is particularly relevant to Site 1.</p> <p>No certainty over the provision of HS2 and the Balsall Common By-pass and as such there are doubts over the provision of a firm eastern Green Belt boundary, without which, as acknowledged in the site assessment that the site would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary. Some of the site is within the highest performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment but not referenced in the site assessment.</p>
Q04	Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]		<p>Half of this site scored 0/12 in the Atkins assessment and that element cannot be included within the housing allocation. It will irreparably harm the greenbelt, reducing the width of the Meriden gap by 50%. This site was proposed for development in March 2016 by SMBC at a meeting with Berkswell PC before any analysis was undertaken.</p> <p>Site has huge amenity and wellbeing value to the community through the network of footpaths linked to the Greenway. These are probably the best and most accessible network of footpaths in the borough and no account has been taken of this loss.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Mr Andrew Fox [5816]		This a is a beautiful part of greenbelt, and the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap. It beggers belief it is being considered for housing! Isn't it enough that HS2 is destroying the greenway? How can a "bypass" with 2 exist, cater for 900 houses, say 1800 cars..? A huge fuel pipeline is being installed through these fields right now, how can that be built upon..? The village will be ruined. The village centre is crazy busy now, little scope to enlarge.
Q04	Mr Barrie Howarth [6132]		Why place the high density housing next to the green belt as this will impose over the green belt. It would be better to place the high density housing towards the village centre. With the low density housing next to the green belt
Q04	Mr Chris Bradshaw [3359]		Provision of car parking for station is essential Provision of affordable housing is essential Adequate areas for recreation including sport, dog walking etc should be provided Control of parking near new school is essential
Q04	Mr Christopher McDermott [3693]		this is key greenfield land close to the heart of the village which gives people the chance to enjoy the outdoors and to be fit and healthy. Removing this will reduce the quality of life of those already living in the village. Furthermore the village centre cannot cope with additional traffic using station road and the shops.
Q04	Mr D Deanshaw [2226]		acceptable - agreed
Q04	Mr D Tabb [4499]		Infrastructure not suitable.
Q04	Mr David Varley [3385]		Not suitable as narrowest part of Meriden Gap, too many houses on single site and air/noise pollution likely to exceed standards Can't be developed until bypass built, so will not contribute to 5 year supply, so smaller sites required. Access from Meeting House Lane unacceptable as would change its character/quality and be unsafe. Multiple ownership makes comprehensive development and phasing challenging. Danger that piecemeal development will involve access from unsuitable residential roads. Concept masterplan does not show green space between existing homes and new development contrary to Neighbourhood Plan

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Mr Gary Lindop [5433]		<p>Far too many houses are proposed to the east of Balsall Common which is highly unfair to our already busy and stretched village in conjunction with the current HS2 development.</p> <p>Building on Barratts Farm would further narrow the Meriden Gap and continue the urbanisation of our beautiful countryside. It would destroy a huge swathe of Green Belt reaching as far as the Kenilworth Greenway which incorporates many footpaths, accessible and regularly used by the village community.</p> <p>You are trying to encourage people to be physically active whilst taking away the green space which allows them to do so!!</p>
Q04	Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]		<p>The proposed development is too large in scale, taking place at the narrowest part of the Meriden gap. Alternative sites in the area were put forward and the Council simply took them as additional housing, putting even more pressure on the community. Along with HS2, the pressure that would be put on the area should be unacceptable to the Council.</p> <p>Access should be from the 'bypass' and Station Road only and there should be open parkland between the development and the present housing which has worked well at Riddings Hill.</p>
Q04	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		<p>Concept Masterplan. The plan shown completely ignores the emerging Berkswell Neighbourhood Plan and is unacceptable. Green space is welcomed but it should be concentrated between existing and new housing and not in the flood plain, unusable at any time after rain. Also concept plans from developers at this early stage have often been ignored when development actually begins. Site has an area of 93ha. At an average dph of 35 this site would have a capacity of 3255 dwellings. Once out of Green Belt this would be totally unprotected from developers who would no doubt see this as their target.</p>
Q04	Mr Graham Thomas [5361]		<p>Given HS2 construction up to 2025 (and beyond?) before the construction on Barratts Farm can start (and the School and Parking spaces) will anything be built before the end of this plan period in 2028?</p> <p>Any By-pass proposals or links between the A45/A46 will suffer the same delays.</p> <p>Do you need alternative plans?</p>
Q04	Mr Henning Kleine [3633]		<p>The development will take away a recreation area including the benefits for dog-walkers and joggers; it will harm the bio-diversity of the Meriden gap. Meeting House Lane unsuitable/unsafe for access. Will lead to piecemeal development in attached areas.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Mr James Hamilton [6038]		<p>Appreciates the need for additional housing Careful thought must be given to the preservation of the Meriden Gap - once land is released from the GB it cannot be reclaimed</p> <p>Concept masterplans: states an intention to develop a tract of open space running through the majority of Barratt's Farm to achieve the 'Riddings Hill' type of development. The proposed 'by-pass' runs right through the middle of this lessening it's recreational use. They do not supply sufficient evidence to make a clear assessment as a resident suggests that any building work should be kept on hold until HS2 construction is</p>
Q04	Mr Julian Henwood [5411]		<p>Building a very substantial housing development on Barratt's Farm will totally alter the semi-rural feel of Balsall Common and would destroy large sections of green belt.</p>
Q04	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		<p>The graduated density of housing and the designation of areas of ecological importance as green buffers is supported. This should be preserved to protect local wildlife.</p> <p>However the plan should reference the Berkswell NDP.</p> <p>Due to safety concerns and as protection for the rural nature of Meeting House Lane vehicular access from site to MHL should not be allowed.</p> <p>The risk of isolation of site from rest of village could be addressed though allowing combination of pedestrian and cycle paths to enable increased green travel opportunities within the environs of the enlarged village.</p>
Q04	Mr Leigh Mayers [3124]		<p>I disagree that this green belt land doesn't perform highly in the Green Belt Assessment. This land is quite clearly either farmed land or shrub.</p> <p>With a total of 900 houses Barrett's farm land will be far too densely populated and more than the surrounding area.</p> <p>Not enough park space for the size and numbers of houses.</p>
Q04	Mr Leslie Noble [3503]		<p>If we have to have the number of houses, using one site to house all the requirements for the village appears the best option rather than several sites across the village cause disruption all over the village.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Mr Paul Joyner [3573]		<p>The imposition of 900 homes in one part of the village will significantly damage the rural aspect of the village.</p> <p>The concept plan is too vague-hard to consult on a non verified picture.</p> <p>Infrastructure improvements outlined will not address the increase of numbers of vehicles, people and movements.</p> <p>Increase in emissions from increased vehicle movements will be significant, as recent developments have shown that car usage increases,even for short journeys.</p> <p>If the Barratts lane development does go forward in some form,I support the bypass solution, with access to the site from there.I do not support access from the village side</p>
Q04	Mr Richard Chadwick [5964]		<p>The Barratts Lane plan will mean our property (Dragonflies) on Waste Lane becomes surrounded by houses and the new bypass, I therefore ask you INCLUDE our property in the development proposal. This will mean more houses and easier access to Waste Lane</p>
Q04	Mr Richard Davis [5665]		<p>1. Over development and no allowance has been made for the the recent increase of noise projection from HS2</p> <p>2. The Catholic site should be retained for football as no other site available in south of village</p> <p>3. The principal accesses have been defined but there should be a guarantee that no access will be onto Barratts Lane, Oxhaves or Meeting House Lane</p>
Q04	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		<p>This site seems to be included to justify/fund a bypass for which no evidence has been presented.</p> <p>It is highly valued for walking by residents and at the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap.</p> <p>The plan does not take account of the Berkswell Parish NDP and appears compromised by the multiple land ownerships. The Berkswell NDP should be taken into account and a plan for the entire site developed not compromised by the diverse ownership.</p> <p>No normal vehicular access should be allowed from minor roads and public green space should be planned between old and new developments</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Mr Ross McKinnon [5602]		The fragmented nature of ownership will make the coordination of development difficult. It is currently unclear where the entry/exit roads to the development will be - will it be via Waste lane/Station road? The surrounding roads such as Meeting house lane, Sunnyside lane etc are not capable of dealing with additional traffic without impacting the quality of life of the residents. Clarification should be provided. If a primary school was to be included then this would increase traffic over and above the residents only traffic making entry/exit more important.
Q04	Mr William Cairns [3206]		Major intrusion into green belt and Meriden Gap and narrows gap between settlement and Coventry for which exceptional circumstances not demonstrated. Selection on grounds that does not perform well in Green Belt Assessment flawed. Concept Masterplan Emerging Masterplan is sketchy and fails to address concerns of residents abutting site. Results in significant loss of access to green belt and recreation field. Design approach for Riddings Hill development should be mirrored, with green space accommodating recreational sport and park with wildlife habitats for use by existing and new residents.
Q04	Mrs Anya Schofield [5921]		The preparations for HS2 have affected a much wider area than originally suggested. Our day to day lives are significantly affected by the current HS2 work specifically - frequent road closures and diversions affecting travel plans, constant heavy traffic affecting our roads and daily routine and walking paths closed and diverted. This will only worsen as HS2 work progresses. These plans centre on the area of Balsall Common most impacted by HS2. Layering onto this work to build houses and related infrastructure in this area would make our daily routine unbearable.
Q04	Mrs Barbara Hedley [5519]		I accept the rationale of moving the Green belt boundary to the new HS2 line, and with access off the Hallmeadow Road roundabout near the station. But losing this large open space needs substantial compensating measures within it to maximise green space areas within, provide additional footpaths throughout, and encourage safe spaces for all the community. New development on this scale should have an overall coherence. There need to be several points of minor access into the area so that it does not become an isolated enclave.
Q04	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		No it is in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap and appears to have been selected to fund a bypass that is not otherwise required
Q04	Mrs Catherine Brown [5731]		900 homes in one plot is wholly excessive for a village of this size. Why is Balsall Common having to adopt such a huge chunk of the housing needs for Solihull? This is a village and should be treated as such. Brownfield sites need to be used. It is not fair to solve Solihull's housing needs by taking away Balsall common's green space and character as a village.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Mrs Christina O'Sullivan [5373]		Phasing Barrett's Farm and using the bypass for construction vehicles is a must as you have suggested. I do however believe you have not shown us any plans on how you will accommodate another 1725 houses
Q04	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		This land is the Meriden Gap and it must be protected from development. I do not agree with the council's green point calculation for Barratt's Farm at all. We will be joined up with Coventry if this is allowed to go ahead.
Q04	Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]		There should be no development in Balsall common before appropriate access and the careful management of speed, traffic and parking problems on Balsall Common roads have been assessed. Traffic calming measures on Meeting House Lane ineffective and safety at risk with no pavements. Developments should definitely be small in size overall and within small clusters of housing that are not identical. We don't want Balsall Common to look like a mini version of Milton Keynes or for developments to create a suburban sprawl.
Q04	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		There must be a better alternative to releasing such a large area from Green Belt in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap which will not be available until HS2 is complete. Residents in Berkswell have been heavily involved in helping to produce Berkswell's Neighbourhood Plan. It is very disappointing that none of these views have been considered in the production of this concept plan. While green space is welcomed but it should be concentrated between existing and new housing. There is also a great fear that concept plans are just that and once developers are involved, they are ignored.
Q04	Mrs Helen Dean [2920]		No comment
Q04	Mrs Helen Goodwin [4636]		I feel very sad that such a wonderful area of historic countryside will be lost forever. I feel it cannot be called progress

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]		<p>The graduated density of housing and the designation of areas of ecological importance as green buffers is supported. This should be preserved at all costs to protect local wildlife.</p> <p>However the plan should reference the Berkswell NDP.</p> <p>Due to safety concerns and as protection for the rural nature of Meeting House Lane, vehicular access from site to MHL should not be allowed.</p> <p>The risk of isolation of site from rest of village could be addressed through allowing combination of pedestrian and cycle paths to enable increased green travel opportunities within the environs of the enlarged village.</p>
Q04	Mrs Karen Hawcutt [3786]		<p>Concern over erosion of green belt and narrowing of strip of Meriden Gap at Barretts Farm between Balsall Common/Coventry. Purpose to prevent urban sprawl being lost. Should investigate fully brownfield opportunities.</p> <p>Concept Masterplan does not consider increased traffic, impact on village centre, parking, as 900 homes means potentially 1800 more cars in area.</p> <p>Concept Plan MUST be strong in order to avoid piecemeal development as site complex with many landowners. Also because of the disruption of HS2 building must not start until after the completion of this major project.</p> <p>Increased pollution, loss of wildlife habitat and rural aspect.</p>
Q04	Mrs Sharon Lindop [6163]		<p>Far too many houses are proposed to the east of Balsall Common which is highly unfair to our already busy and stretched village in conjunction with the current HS2 development.</p> <p>Building on Barratts Farm would further narrow the Meriden Gap and continue the urbanisation of our beautiful countryside. It would destroy a huge swathe of Green Belt reaching as far as the Kenilworth Greenway which incorporates many footpaths, accessible and regularly used by the village community.</p> <p>You are trying to encourage people to be physically active whilst taking away the green space which allows them to do so!!</p>
Q04	Ms Wendy Gault [6134]		<p>.I do not agree that Barrett's farm should be included as an allocated site because Solihull Council has failed to study alternatives and there are errors in the Q02.</p> <p>Furthermore the green belt assessments indicate a large part of this site is scored as Solihull's most valuable greenbelt. Based on this it is hard to understand how the site selection methodolgy has resulted in the selection of this site.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Paula Haynes [5922]		<p>- Proposals put the Meriden Gap under threat and do not enhance the Green Belt (as stated in paragraph 96).</p> <p>- Coventry are also building into the Green Belt towards Solihull boundary (Burton Green) thus narrowing gap.</p> <p>- Barratt's Farm is at the narrowes</p>
Q04	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		<p>This site is objected to as it is poorly related to employment areas. It is remote from good quality bus services, much of the site will be sterilised by a statutory duty to consider the preservation of the setting of several affected listed buildings. Furthermore the provision of primary education using a Section 106 agreement is unlawful.</p>
Q04	Professor David Walton [3795]		<p>Scale/distribution of growth not equitable, settlement being concreted over and green space not being protected.</p> <p>Massive infilling of green space around Balsall Common will shrink green belt in this part of the Meriden Gap to little more than a few fields. Loss of green belt despite pledges from Mayor to protect.</p> <p>No Ecological Assessments made available to public, and hard to know why some sites in Balsall Common score so poorly for sustainability and other key criteria.</p> <p>Area is rich in wildlife/birds/insects/bats/amphibians and even deer. Previous building in the vicinity a sign that village has already made a positive contribution.</p>
Q04	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the build rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan, as demonstrated by the adjacent Bellway scheme.</p>
Q04	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan. This is particularly important for affordable housing, and our Client's site has the ability to deliver a 100% affordable housing scheme within the early years of the Plan period.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the assumed built rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Our Client's land is available now and can be delivered early in the Plan period.
Q04	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's - site 416) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q04	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We agree with the identification of the Balsall Common sites given the sustainable nature of the settlement. However it is clear that employment land will be required.
Q04	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q04	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		No, this site is adjacent to both HS2 and the new by pass and both of those should be developed first before any new housing is allocated for the site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Richard Lloyd [2616]		<p>Site selection is based on deeply flawed Green Belt and Accessibility analyses, skewed to secure a dividend from the proposed housing to support the proposed by-pass.</p> <p>Expansion further into green belt invalidates assessments, no defensible green belt boundaries and is higher performing green belt, particularly for preventing settlements from merging.</p> <p>Value for agriculture, environment, recreation underestimated, with poor housing yield due to need for mitigation. Fails to take account of visibility of heritage assets from south.</p> <p>Proposed public open space in least accessible location, should be adjacent existing housing to mitigate impact.</p> <p>Blocks of different densities inappropriate, should be inter-mixing and gradation.</p> <p>Retention of mature trees should be integrated into design.</p> <p>Poorly accessible by public transport and road, remote from employment areas.</p>
Q04	Roderick Hatton [5809]		<p>Narrowest part of Meriden gap will be eliminated.</p> <p>Large areas of open space required to compensate for loss of Green Belt.</p> <p>Need undeveloped areas to allow for wildlife movement and landscaped areas including footpaths and cycleways through the development.</p> <p>Need separation from existing residences.</p> <p>Vehicular access should be from the new bypass. Pedestrian and cycle only access from surrounding roads.</p> <p>Development should commence after the completion of HS2.</p> <p>No construction traffic along Meeting House Lane</p> <p>Bypass should be built first to take construction traffic.</p> <p>Development to be in accordance with masterplan and Design Guide produced for developers to comply with.</p>
Q04	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is particularly relevant to Site 1.</p> <p>No certainty over the provision of HS2 and the Balsall Common By-pass and as such there are doubts over the provision of a firm eastern Green Belt boundary, without which, as acknowledged in the site assessment that the site would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary. Some of the site is within the highest performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment but not referenced in the site assessment.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	Sheila Cooper [2560]		Green belt and site assessments flawed. Taking maximum amount of Green Belt land instead of the minimum requirement for the development is flawed. Reduces green belt gap between settlement and the Coventry/Burton Green conurbation from 2 km to just over 1km. The Concept Plan is contrary to NDP as it fails to place public space between existing and new homes. All access should be from by-pass. Flood plain not suitable as open space. Area close to HS2, should be allocated to medium/ high-density housing as sound insulation and noise reduction steps will bring internal noise levels well within WHO Guidelines.
Q04	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	Spitfire does not contest the principle of an allocation being made. It does however contest that based on the current site boundaries, the number of dwellings is too high when proper consideration is given to its constraints including its sensitivity in relation the Green Belt and listed buildings. Proposal for high density development along by-pass route is out of character, will create urbanising effect and result in poor quality environment. Site has complex ownerships and uncertain delivery. Allocation should be extended to include Sites 101 and 102 and range of builders will help delivery.
Q04	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is particularly relevant to Site 1. No certainty over the provision of HS2 and the Balsall Common By-pass and as such there are doubts over the provision of a firm eastern Green Belt boundary, without which, as acknowledged in the site assessment that the site would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary. Some of the site is within the highest performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment but not referenced in the site assessment.
Q04	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is particularly relevant to Site 1. No certainty over the provision of HS2 and the Balsall Common By-pass and as such there are doubts over the provision of a firm eastern Green Belt boundary, without which, as acknowledged in the site assessment that the site would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary. Some of the site is within the highest performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment but not referenced in the site assessment.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q04	The Ramblers, warwickshire Area (Mr Michael Bird) [3483]		Whilst having no comments to make on the other smaller housing allocation sites in Balsall Common, Warwickshire Ramblers object to the Barretts Farm Allocation on Green Belt, footpath and over-development grounds.
Q04	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		There is a need to better protect the significant ecological features within the concept plans; SMBC 's plan is preferable.
Q04	Wendy Cairns [4226]		Erosion of green belt and weakening of the Meriden Gaps main purpose to stop urban sprawl. If developed all access to be from the bypass/feeder road thereby ensuring vehicle traffic is removed from centre of village.Land adjacent to existing properties Meeting House Lane Oxhayes Close should be preserved as an open recreational space for formal and informal use providing a buffer zone to be enjoyed by both old and new settlements as Riddings Hill. No piecemeal development of small sites around Barretts Farm. Concept plan so incomplete it is of little use to comprehend likely outcome needs more work

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Balsall Common			
Q05	Aidan Blanco [3056]		Site is not a viable option and the negative impacts on the local community and green belt to the South of the village significantly out weigh the value it can deliver as a solution to housing shortage. It is too small a development, will add increased strain on the local congestion and pollution around the primary school, set precedent for green belt development to south of village, is too far from station and shops thereby encouraging car based travel and will blight the views for miles south of the village.
Q05	Andrea Baker [3471]		This is actually a prime site for rebuilding three purpose-built schools. A nursery and infant school, and then a junior/secondary campus. With proper traffic flow management and access to each, traffic congestion could be drastically reduced, and would comfortably still form the hard boundaries outlined here. Traffic roundabouts could be installed at the junctions with Balsall Street to manage the traffic properly. The existing sites could be sold and the combined sites would allow slightly more houses (over 140) than this site would allow. It would also allow for them to be built before HS2 is completed.
Q05	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		Object, as a 'settlement first' approach should retain green belt boundary to south-west of Balsall Common, with Balsall Street/East a defensible boundary rather than 'cherry pick' site. Would set precedent potentially opening up land to Saracen Drive and impact on rural character of Frog Lane. Preferred use of site should be for expanded sports facilities. Site not accessible as furthest from station and village amenities. Will worsen highway congestion concerns in Balsall Street near to Holly Lane/Alder Lane hot spot and use as single carriageway by buses due to parking. Key local habitat. Medium density housing conflicts with local character.
Q05	Councillor D Bell [2235]		Concept Masterplan. Mentions a green area at the north end of Frog lane but the present residents of Balsall St East were at one time promised a bund or green corridor behind their houses. I would suggest this is preferable and would provide a walkway through to the playing fields.
Q05	Councillor D Bell [2235]		Do not agree to inclusion of this site as it is too far from amenities. My neighbour has to get a taxi to the shops. Also site has considerable worth as greenfield and wildlife havens.
Q05	Councillor D Bell [2235]		I believe that Balsall St and Balsall St. East should be the boundary of development in the western side of this village. I believe that if you allow Frog Lane then further development will occur. Development this far out from the centre of the village is unsustainable. All that it is near is the overcrowded Primary School

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q05	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Support retention of playing field/allotments and habitat improvements. Single point of access problematic for emergencies and disruption during works. Road intersecting grassland area is concern that needs to be addressed.
Q05	Diane Howell [5567]		Pockets of green belt should not be built on because they can be. This will erode the character of the area. Better to have fewer, larger development sites that can support infrastructure improvements. This site contributes a low number of housing, delivers no infrastructure but decimates the character of one of the few country lanes left in BC. It will set a precedent for development on the Balsall Street boundary. Balsall Street East is already very congested due to school parking; road safety issues as the access road would be on a bend.
Q05	Gemma Blanco [4349]		Froglane should not be included as it promotes erosion of intrinsic green belt and habitat, contradicts 'settlement first approach' (paragraph 7) and would set a precedent for future/adjacent greenfield developments. It is not ideally situated to transport links and local amenities, promoting reliance on vehicles, negatively impacting on a rural environment. Close proximity to school - increased traffic on an already congested road - threatening children's lives.
Q05	Greig File [6082]		The main issues here would be proximity to the central amenities and further overload on the primary school. With a second school planned near the Barratts Farm development this will place extra strain on an already stretched facility
Q05	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		Historic England understands that a Heritage Impact Assessment of this proposed allocation has been commissioned by the local authority. This vital evidence will help the Council and interested parties in a consideration of the site's suitability in principle and, without prejudice, an appropriate design response to satisfy national policy and legislation in relation to the historic environment and the delivery of sustainable development. Notwithstanding that the above evidence has not been applied, Historic England acknowledge the merit of the SMBC Draft Concept Masterplanning exercise and how the local authority considers potential future development might respond to the affected heritage assets.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q05	Isabel Rose Wilson [5861]		<p>Objection to development of site 2 - Frog Lane Resident of Balsall Street East which backs on to the fields of Frog Lane Proposed development on a green space would affect negatively on the future of life in Balsall Common. Balsall Street East is home to many elderly people who wish to live a quiet life. There are individuals here that cannot voice their own opinions Balsall Street East is a busy road already and cannot host more traffic. Cars often already exceed the speed limit. The increase in traffic would have a negative impact on local children - there are families with young children on the street and it is the main point of access for the children of Balsall Common Primary School.</p>
Q05	Izumi Segawa [5872]		<p>Building on all available land means that the British countryside is losing to yet more ugly houses. If you look at the town itself, which is currently quite grotty, there is more opportunity for (better) development - above/behind shops/unnecessarily large car park by Co-op. Instead of choosing the easy option of building on blank canvas, you should use more imagination to maximise the use of the existing town. There is a need for more accommodation but building hundreds of individual houses sounds very inefficient. If you need to tackle the housing deficiency, build more flats in the town centre.</p>
Q05	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	<p>To summarise our position, in our view the land at Frog Lane performs a more important role in terms of Green Belt function than at Grange Farm. As such the following observations should have been taken into account when Frog Lane was categorised: The release of land at Frog Lane will result in development extending southwards and would represent a clear physical extension of development into the countryside. Our conclusion was that Frog Lane should score 7 in terms of GB impact whereas Grange Farm should score 5 and should thus be preferred</p>
Q05	Mr Chris Bradshaw [3359]		<p>The density of housing proposed is too great and out of character with the existing mature housing development. Sport and recreation facilities at Holly Lane Park should be developed with changing/toilet facilities and off road carparking using the existing wide verge on Holly Lane. Frog Lane should be widened and footpath created, with traffic calming in the area of blind double bends</p>
Q05	Mr D Deanshaw [2226]		<p>Not acceptable - should be removed, sets a dangerous precedent south of B4101, will lead to pressure for widening of Frog Lane and expansion further west, could be used for sports facilities or hotel/offices, with housing relocated to Grange Farm.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q05	Mr David Varley [3385]		Frog Lane will make a good defensible boundary for any development. Being towards the south of Balsall Common building could take place without being constrained by other developments such as HS2 or By-pass. It is easy to travel in all directions from the site by car and is a relatively easy walk down Station Road directly to the Station.
Q05	Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]		Given the need for additional housing, the site appears suitable.
Q05	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		This site is in the Green Belt and I do not believe sufficient exceptional circumstances as required by the NPPF have been justified. I am also concerned that although the Concept Master Plan only shows development on the western half of the site, the eastern half including the playing fields and the allotments have also been released from the Green Belt. This would mean this area would have little protection against development applications in the future.
Q05	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		Frog Lane is of particular amenity value for the local community. Balsall Common already has a clear and long established defensible boundary in Balsall Street/Balsall Street East
Q05	Mr Leslie Noble [3503]		The Frog Lane site is south of the village, exceeds into green belt which may cause further expansion later on. The housing would also be too far away from the village amenities, schools, transport etc
Q05	Mr Paul Joyner [3573]		Bounded infill.
Q05	Mr Richard Burgess [5518]		Way too large for the village
Q05	Mr Richard Davis [5665]		Support
Q05	Mr Richard Hansell [6034]		Frog Lane is a very narrow country road with little traffic and well liked and used by walkers. Unlike Barratt's Farm the Green Belt to the south is beautiful rolling countryside. Poor access alone makes it totally inappropriate to build over 100 homes here. The lane itself is likely to become a rat-race, and once the homes are built there'll be nothing to stop further development eastwards. With only a narrow road separating the houses from the Green Belt it will then be only a matter of time before development extends southwards. Frog Lane is certainly not a defensible boundary!
Q05	Mr William Cairns [3206]		Ideal site for small development close to bus routes, schools and within meaningful distance to the centre with a good rural outlook.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q05	Mrs Barbara Hedley [5519]		Is this area sufficiently protected from noise and pollution from aircraft to and from Birmingham? It seems that development on this south facing slope will be very prominent in the landscape. But I accept that Frog Lane does offer a natural and defensible green belt boundary for the future. The local junior school would be under pressure, but if the new school on Barratts Farm has 3 form entry, there may be capacity released.
Q05	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		This plan maintains the playing fields.
Q05	Mrs Eleanor Lee [6172]		As defined in the human rights act protocol article 1, a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions which includes their home. As a resident of Balsall Street East I have concerns of being overlooked, Solihull council has responsibility to uphold this and not introduce 115 homes adjacent to and overlooking our home. Introduction of 150 new homes with a single access point for over 200 cars will cause increased congestion and pollution To Balsall Street East. Frog Lane is at the furthest point from any local amenities and transport links making an already congested road significantly worse.
Q05	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		I am concerned that the Concept Master Plan only shows development on part of the site being released from Green Belt. This gives little protection from future development on the playing fields and allotments.
Q05	Mrs Helen Dean [2920]		Strongly object to the development of site as density out of character with existing, does not provide bungalows to meet local need, pedestrian/vehicle/emergency access remains inadequate with unsuitable path to Balsall Street East, no cycle access and no indication how parking will be restricted at access, low accessibility to amenities, loss of trees/hedgerows/habitats, lack of protection for SI Grassland, need for TPOs, loss of privacy and security. SMBC is cherry picking sites to meet their housing requirements and does not have a strategic plan for the development of this settlement as a whole.
Q05	Mrs Helen Goodwin [4636]		Moving the Green Belt boundary is the thin end of the wedge. Balsall Street East is already a natural boundary and should remain so. Area far to small to accommodate 110 house, the access is very ambiguous (as it states in the plan, may need 2) and the roads around the area are all far to small for approx 170 cars.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q05	Mrs Joan Bissett [5290]		The land is an isolated parcel with an access onto Frog Lane is a narrow country lane and there is a requirement for traffic to negotiate a blind corner in order to access the junction onto Balsall St East. My historical knowledge since the early 50's are of frequent road collisions at this blind corner including both vehicles and livestock.etc. Frog Lane also opens onto the junction with Holly Lane and a here again The junction is on a substantial bend. Both access points would not safely sustain the volume of traffic which would inevitably occur with the proposed development.
Q05	Mrs Moya Melville [5948]		Frog Lane as it currently exists very clearly marks the southern boundary of the surrounding Green Belt. The construction of 110 houses adjacent to the lane will change the rural nature of the area forever by greatly increasing traffic, noise, loss of visual amenity and will turn Frog Lane itself into a rat run. The lane is currently very popular with walkers of all ages who will no longer be able quickly and easily to access open countryside from surrounding houses. Once this land is lost, it will be too easy to permit further development into the surrounding countryside.
Q05	Ms Wendy Gault [6134]		Q02 is not robust and loss of green belt
Q05	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		It is considered this site is poorly related to employment facilities and very intrusive into the openness of the Green Belt.
Q05	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the build rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan, as demonstrated by the adjacent Bellway scheme.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q05	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan. This is particularly important for affordable housing, and our Client's site has the ability to deliver a 100% affordable housing scheme within the early years of the Plan period.
Q05	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the assumed built rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Our Client's land is available now and can be delivered early in the Plan period.
Q05	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's - site 416) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q05	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We agree with the identification of the Balsall Common sites given the sustainable nature of the settlement. However as above, it is clear that employment land will be required
Q05	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, such as Site 1. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q05	Richard Lloyd [2616]		The proposed layout simply takes the available space and fills it with houses. The proposal would be less intrusive if the adjacent playing fields, and possibly the allotments, were redistributed to create green spaces between the houses. While incurring extra cost and disruption, it would create a far more attractive area, and there would be an opportunity to provide access onto Holly Lane.
Q05	Richborough Estates [3816]	Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]	Support, as settlement is a sustainable location for growth. Alternative access proposed to reduce length of highway crossing grassland area, and biodiversity benefits will provide compensatory improvements for loss of green belt. Second access not required as scope to provide emergency access. Opportunity to provide a range of dwelling types/sizes at a density that respects the adjacent settlement pattern and the site's location on the edge of Balsall Common. Due to the strongly defined boundaries, housing on the site would not be visually intrusive within the wider landscape setting of Balsall Common when viewed from the surrounding countryside.
Q05	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	This allocation has already been reduced in numbers to around 100-110 and questions must be raised as to whether it will be able to deliver the amount set out.
Q05	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		Welcome the retention of the playing fields at the eastern end of the site and this should be reflected in the policy allocating the site. Alternatively, the playing fields should be removed from the proposed allocation.
Q05	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		The Ecological Assessment (Jan 17) identifies areas of woodland and meadow grassland that are of significant ecological value along with species rich hedgerow and veteran trees. The concept plan proposed by Pegasus and Richbrough Estates retains the some of the meadow grassland, but dissects the field with the access road. The SMBC concept plan shows the access road to one edge of the meadow grassland which would allow better management of the space as one unit. We therefore support the SMBC concept plan.
Q05	Wendy Cairns [4226]		Ideal for a small community development it is close to the main schools and reasonable distance to the centre and close to bus routes

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Balsall Common			
Q06	Andrea Baker [3471]		This is clear green belt, with historic buildings and protected wildlife species. There is no justification for destroying this for the sake of even more houses.
Q06	Andy Wilson [3394]		Greenfield site in green belt/Meriden Gap that Mayor has pledged to protect. Performs poorly in sustainability appraisal. Area is rich in wildlife. No plans for nature reserves, unlike the other sites at Frog Lane/Barrett's Farm, so the habitat/feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable and poor accessibility will exacerbate congestion. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting residents amenity and the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Anna Waters [6204]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites were put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. This is not a fair distribution particularly as the village will have to deal with HS2. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt in the Meriden Gap and should be protected as the Mayor and Leader of the Council has pledged. It would create the narrowest gap between settlements do not understand why it is being included. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible because it stretches so far from the village boundary and therefore people would need to drive to shops, medical centre, train station and primary school. Development would harm the Grade II* listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife including owls, red kites. Woodpeckers and protected Great Crested Newts . Light pollution from street lights will have an impact on nocturnal creatures. Road access is unsuitable either onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane or through Meer Stones Road estate - this is already turning into a rat run. Development would impact on current residents, in some parts medium density housing is proposed with no green buffer to preserve visual amenity. Construction noise and vibration will affect residents and could cause long term damage to Berkswell Windmill.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Annie Lutzy [6293]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Arta Golestani [5527]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]		The site is a considerable distance from amenities and is unsustainable in terms of travel, which will lead to greater car usage resulting in further traffic congestion and problems over parking both at the Railway Station and in Balsall Common Centre. The large removal of land from the Green Belt has not been fully assessed, and it also fails to fully assess the impact of large scale development on the listed ancient Windmill which is an important heritage site.
Q06	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		Reservations about allocation as site has low accessibility, residents will require high levels of parking, additional traffic accessing already congested Kenilworth Road, phasing conflicts with HS2 construction and must be postponed until HS2 completed and/or by-pass opened. Should consider emerging Balsall Parish NDP policies in master planning of site; housing to respect local character, mixed development with range of house types and sizes, opportunities for low carbon development, existing trees and hedgerows to be protected, include at least 10% bungalows or other suitable accommodation for downsizing of mobile older residents.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		<p>Object as failed to study alternatives and there are errors in the Q02. Green belt deletion disproportionate to development area due to ecological restrictions, and greater than required elsewhere.</p> <p>Concept masterplan underestimates impact on setting of listed building and SMBC has failed to engage properly with owner, particularly relating to impact on wind flow.</p> <p>Site beyond acceptable distance to centre/surgery/station and outside desirable distance to schools, so will be highly car dependent and unsustainable.</p> <p>Concerned estate roads will impact on protected species, and that ecological report shows building on 2 areas of importance.</p> <p>Concept Masterplan Ignores emerging NDP as green space not provided between existing (Wellfield Close) and new development.</p> <p>Concerned at impact of access onto Windmill Lane as no pavements, traffic will affect rural character and traffic hazard at Kenilworth Road junction. Access should be solely to Kenilworth Road, achievable with by-pass.</p> <p>Traffic calming measures on Meer Stones development not effective, so concern about speeds on Windmill Lane.</p>
Q06	Beth Foster [4057]		<p>While I recognise that new homes are needed I object to the significant number proposed for our area. Such huge changes to our area will drive current residents away and change significantly the character of our village.</p> <p>New residents will endure limited green space and infrastructure pressures. There are no footpaths on Windmill Lane, no mains sewers or gas supplies.</p> <p>Impact on Berkswell Windmill overlooked as it will be sandwiched between new homes and by-pass.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Bill Young [6058]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites were put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. This is not a fair distribution particularly as the village will have to deal with HS2. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt in the Meriden Gap and should be protected as the Mayor and Leader of the Council has pledged. It would create the narrowest gap between settlements do not understand why it is being included. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible because it stretches so far from the village boundary and therefore people would need to drive to shops, medical centre, train station and primary school. Development would harm the Grade II* listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife including owls, red kites. Woodpeckers and protected Great Crested Newts . Road access is unsuitable either onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane or through Meer Stones Road estate - this is already turning into a rat run. Development would impact on current residents, in some parts medium density housing is proposed with no green buffer to preserve visual amenity. Construction noise and vibration will affect residents and could cause long term damage to Berkswell Windmill.</p>
Q06	Carole Beattie [5601]		<p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise</p>
Q06	Catesby Estates Limited [3038]	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	<p>Draft Concept Masterplan supported in principle.</p> <p>A Concept Masterplan for the development of the allocation should include flexibility to ensure any subsequent planning application for development of the Site is able to take account of the different land interests across the allocation whilst utilising baseline evidence / concepts to ensure a comprehensive development overall.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed development should be put forward at the appropriate time to promote the most sustainable development achievable; matters such as access points should not be fixed within the Concept Masterplan.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Catesby Estates Limited [3038]	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Site 3 represents a natural extension to Balsall Common which reflects the limited landscape impact and the site's proximity to a good range of services and facilities. The rationale for its identification is considered to be sound. Development would not harm purposes of green belt as evidenced in GBA, with loss of openness restricted to well-contained area. The need for housing in Solihull is evident and the identification of this site for housing is justified with reference to the evidence base informing the Local Plan Review.
Q06	Catherine Langton [3384]		Greenfield site in green belt/Meriden Gap that Mayor has pledged to protect. Performs poorly in sustainability appraisal. Area is rich in wildlife. No plans for nature reserves, unlike the other sites at Frog Lane/Barrett's Farm, so the habitat/feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable and poor accessibility will exacerbate congestion. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting residents amenity and the numerous species of local wildlife.
Q06	CGA Taylor [4250]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Christopher Read [6267]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Christopher Fellows [6118]		Call for Sites reference 47, at northern end of Site 3, is priority 5 in Step 1 of Methodology. Despite SA findings of 4 positive, 7 neutral and 6 negative, including 1 significant negative, and commentary that site could be considered as part of a larger area, it is rated green after Step 2.
Q06	Councillor D Bell [2235]		Do not agree to the inclusion of this site as it is too far from amenities, which has considerable worth as greenfield and wildlife haven.
Q06	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Would result in harm to heritage asset Berkswell Windmill, including disruption of wind flow. Development would have detrimental impact on local biodiversity due to impact on protected species which cannot easily be mitigated. Buffer zone around the woodland is not being respected sufficiently. Site performs poorly with regard to connectivity to centre.
Q06	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>No. We wish to object to the Council's proposal to allocate Site 3, in Balsall Common, as part of the Local Plan. Although there are many reasons why the site is unsustainable, we are particularly concerned about the ecological impact the development of this site would have. The Green Infrastructure map Habitat Distinctiveness 2016 shows that this is an area of High Habitat distinctiveness, where development should be avoided (see p4 of the Ecological Assessment). However, these have not been fully respected when cross referenced to p23 of the master plans, particularly with regards to the 30m buffer around woodland.</p> <p>Although there is no doubt as to the high impact the site would have on biodiversity (Draft Concept Plans, p24), Solihull Council's proposed solution would appear to be focussed around offsetting rather than preserving these precious habitats. There are other smaller sites that have a higher sustainability scoring and a lesser ecological value than Site 3.</p>
Q06	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>Object to site 3.</p> <p>Site is unsustainable for many reasons.</p> <p>Particular concern over ecological impact of developing site, in an area of high habitat distinctiveness.</p> <p>Too much focus on biodiversity offsetting.</p> <p>There are other smaller sites with a higher sustainability scoring and a lesser ecological value.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	David Langton [3382]		Greenfield site in green belt/Meriden Gap that Mayor has pledged to protect. Performs poorly in sustainability appraisal. Area is rich in wildlife. No plans for nature reserves, unlike the other sites at Frog Lane/Barrett's Farm, so the habitat/feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable and poor accessibility will exacerbate congestion. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting residents amenity and the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Diane Langton [3380]		Greenfield site in green belt/Meriden Gap that Mayor has pledged to protect. Performs poorly in sustainability appraisal. Area is rich in wildlife. No plans for nature reserves, unlike the other sites at Frog Lane/Barrett's Farm, so the habitat/feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable and poor accessibility will exacerbate congestion. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting residents amenity and the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Diane Howell [5567]		The Elysian Fields development has set a precedent here, however any new development must be better planned and integrate into existing housing character. The presence of the newts mean that a portion of the site cannot be developed. Therefore I would question why you are still pushing for building on this site. Might there be other sites that are easier to develop ?
Q06	Dominique McGarry [4414]		In summary, I would urge that the council take note of this response and remove Site 3 from the Draft Local Plan. There is no doubt, based on SMBC's criteria, that the site is neither sustainable nor accessible. Given the number of housing units available on the brownfield sites, it is unnecessary and incomprehensible as to why the site has not been taken out already. There is no need to build here.
Q06	Dominique McGarry [4414]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Eileen Lamb [5709]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Ella McGarry [4246]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Ferdous Gossain [5606]		<p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Francoise Read [6268]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is relevant to Site 3. Although endeavouring to provide a firm and defensible Green Belt boundary the site becomes increasingly remote from the settlement in accessibility terms and produces a somewhat contrived, insensitive and illogical addition to Balsall Common which could result in a visually unattractive entrance into the settlement from the South.
Q06	Greig File [6082]		Remoteness of the site is an issue, adding significant traffic to access the centre. Creating a "cutthrough" on the development to windmill lane/bypass is another. The supposedly protected newt site would be decimated. Primary school places would either be in the already stretched existing site of way over the other side of the village
Q06	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		Clarify what is meant by "zone of significant influence" and how "high architectural value" may be relevant in relation to the Windmill. The Council's Heritage Impact Assessment should inform consideration of the principle of the site's suitability and an appropriate design response. The Council should demonstrate that it has: -taken sufficient account of the evidence to avoid or minimise harm to the significance of the Windmill -attached great weight to the conservation of the Windmill and -had due regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the Windmill in the wider landscape Without the Council's Heritage Impact Assessment Historic England is unable to consider whether the principle and proposed response set out in the SMBC Draft <u>Concept Masterplan is appropriate.</u>
Q06	Iain Foster [3579]		Greenfield site in green belt/Meriden Gap that should be protected. Performs poorly in sustainability appraisal. Area is rich in wildlife. No plans for nature reserves, unlike the other sites at Frog Lane/Barrett's Farm, so the habitat/feeding grounds for wildlife, including great-crested newts will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable and poor accessibility will exacerbate congestion. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting residents amenity and the numerous species of local wildlife.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Izumi Segawa [5872]		<p>Building on all available land means that the British countryside is losing to yet more ugly houses.</p> <p>If you look at the town itself, which is currently quite grotty, there is more opportunity for (better) development - above/behind shops/unnecessarily large car park by Co-op. Instead of choosing the easy option of building on greenbelt and farmland, you should use more imagination to maximise the use of the existing town. There is a need for more accommodation but building hundreds of individual houses sounds very inefficient. If you need to tackle the housing deficiency, build more flats in the town centre.</p>
Q06	Jean Fleming [3444]		<p>Greenfield site in green belt/Meriden Gap that Mayor has pledged to protect. Performs poorly in sustainability appraisal. Area is rich in wildlife. No plans for nature reserves, unlike the other sites at Frog Lane/Barrett's Farm, so the habitat/feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable and poor accessibility will exacerbate congestion. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting residents amenity and the numerous species of local wildlife</p>
Q06	Jean Kelly [5684]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise</p>
Q06	Jeanette McGarry [4247]		<p>Concept Masterplan</p> <p>Fails to factor in need for tunnels beneath roads crossing protected species habitat, or for ponds at either end.</p> <p>Should identify and safeguard areas of biodiversity importance within the site. Significantly underestimates impact of Windmill and its setting with visual impact shown restricted to Windmill Lane, which is clearly not the case. Higher visual impact shown for heritage assets on masterplan for Site 1. Concern echoed by experts/specialist organisations. Development will also adversely affect wind power essential to operation of Windmill and damage its ability to function.</p> <p>Concerned that SMBC has failed to engage with owner over issue of free flow of wind with inadequate heritage impact assessment.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Jeanette McGarry [4247]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Joelle Hill [4425]		I am worried about the impact on the area around Berkswell Windmill which is a historic monument. Generally anything that could impair/impact on this lovely building would be a terrible shame.
Q06	Johan Vanderstelt [5776]		any development in the surroundings of Berkswell windmill will have a negative impact on the airflow to and from the mill and therefore any changes on the current arrangement of the environment and surroundings of the mill will have a negative impact on the operation, historic value and is against the preservation of the mill
Q06	John Boucher [4012]		The proposed construction of housing on Area 3 will damage the Landscape Value of Berkswell Windmill and also damage its ability to operate as a nationally important historic asset. I know from personal experience elsewhere that obstructing free airflow to and from a windmill severely restricts the satisfactory functioning of historic windmills.
Q06	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	To summarise our position, in our view the land at Windmill Lane performs a more important role in terms of Green Belt function than at Grange Farm. The release of land at Windmill Lane plays an important role in preventing development extending into the countryside and resulting in urban sprawl. The narrow shape of the land within Site 3 extends disproportionately from the southern edge of the settlement and would have a significant negative impact on the local environment in this location. Windmill Lane plays a more important role in terms of GB function than at Grange Farm
Q06	Lisa Champion [5325]		I strongly object to the proposed access to the site from the new development off the Kenilworth Road. These access routes are narrow and cannot accommodate 2 lanes of traffic easily and there are no footpaths. The scale of the proposed development will add considerably to the noise/traffic in Drovers close. A site visit will confirm that the design and layout of the existing roads would not accommodate this access.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mark Taft [3595]		It is important to protect local Heritage. The windmill and surrounding site should be preserved. There should be a buffer zone around the windmill so it can be seen in context, also not impeding the wind flow should it can be powered by wind again in the future
Q06	Midland Wind and Water Mills Group (John Bedington) [3511]		Berkswell Windmill is an exquisite example surviving in its original state and setting, and is unique in the West Midlands. Development opposite the Historic windmill site would significantly effect the importance of its setting in the landscape and destroy the characteristic view over the fields. The development would fatally damage the flow of air to the mill, especially as the prevailing wind is from the south-west. The mill is open to visitors occasionally, and if the wind is strong enough visitors can see the sails turning. This would not be possible if the wind is blocked.
Q06	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is relevant to Site 3. Although endeavouring to provide a firm and defensible Green Belt boundary the site becomes increasingly remote from the settlement in accessibility terms and produces a somewhat contrived, insensitive and illogical addition to Balsall Common which could result in a visually unattractive entrance into the settlement from the South.
Q06	Mr Nick Reading [5808]		The setting of the Grade II* listed mill, with its open aspect, will be adversely affected by intrusions into this open space. Development close to the mill could also adversely affect the power of the wind which is essential to the efficient turning of the sails. It is vitally important to retain historic buildings and their setting, and I therefore wish to object strongly to development in this case, which will affect such a setting
Q06	Mr Paul Lynch [5627]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	We write on behalf of our client, Paul Lynch who owns 0.38 hectares of land to the rear of Kelsey Court, Balsall Common (SHELAA ref 138). The Draft Local Plan Supplementary Consultation includes our client's land as part of a larger housing allocation at Windmill Lane (Site 3), which has been identified as having capacity for 220 dwellings. We continue to strongly support this allocation which will help towards meeting the Districts housing needs. With regard to the masterplan, our clients land is identified as 'low density housing' which is supported. The proposed access via Kelsey Court is also supported.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]		Narrows green belt/Meriden Gap which Mayor has pledged to protect. Performs poorly in sustainability terms. The area is rich in wildlife. No plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, so the habitat and feeding grounds will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument. Noise from development on top of disruption from HS2 works. No green buffer to existing housing.
Q06	Mr Alfred Valler [3115]	Mr Ronald Perrin [2684]	<p>My clients of Windmill Lane, Balsall Common, support the inclusion of site 3, and their land is specifically referred to in paragraph 112 of the consultation document. The site would form a new boundary of the Green Belt, which is clearly defensible in the long term. It also encloses some land that is already developed and land that could be reasonably developed.</p> <p>My clients would be prepared to include their house and commercial buildings for development on this site, increasing capacity of the allocation itself.</p> <p>It would be appropriate to reuse the existing access from Windmill Lane.</p>
Q06	Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]		The ecological restrictions on this site and the setting of the windmill make the housing delivered versus the land required to be removed from the greenbelt a poor swap. The site is also too far from the village amenities (shops, doctors, station and even schools) to make it a sustainable location. It will be totally car dependent. More suitable sites within the borough without these restrictions are available both in Balsall Common and Dorridge
Q06	Mr Andrew Hall [5302]		Congestion on Kenilworth Rd is already excessive, especially at peak times causing rat runs down Windmill Lane etc. Access out of Meer Stones Road is already hard and and new building would need extra entry/exit via Windmill Lane as a minimum or roundabout on Meer Stones Road. Speeding is already excessive down Kenilworth road in this area as well. Also, need additional local amenities including doctors, dentist, schools, shops to support additional housing being planned. Please do not progress!

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mr C Gledhill [4812]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Mr Christopher Seel [5370]		<p>Access to the site is very poor - the road will not accommodate more traffic (it is very narrow with no pavements)</p> <p><u>Building on this site will cause congestion on the road at peak times</u></p> <p>Important to learn lessons of earlier poor strategic decisions.</p>
Q06	Mr D Deanshaw [2226]		<p>Concept Masterplan</p> <p>Parking area needed for Listed Building - Windmill - tourist attraction. Avoid 3 storey development on narrow roads.</p>
Q06	Mr D Edmonds [4808]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Mr D Perks [3399]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Mr David Varley [3385]		<p>The site on Kenilworth Road has already been built on and the land up to Windmill Lane is not particularly good. However, any access onto Windmill Lane would need to see improvements to Windmill Lane itself.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mr Derrick Walker [4780]		The area is rich in wildlife. . As there are no plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. There is also the danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. . Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Mr Dominic Mayes [5304]		These plans will impact the current Elysian Gardens development negatively. Negative impact to prices and sale-ability of current properties on the Elysian Gardens estate particularly during building work.
Q06	Mr G Wilkinson [4788]		The area is rich in wildlife. . As there are no plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. There is also the danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. . Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Mr G Frost [4809]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise
Q06	Mr Gary Lindop [5433]		Development of the site will further narrow the Meriden Gap. The site is poorly positioned for residents to access village amenities. Road access to and from the site is restricted. The area is rich in wildlife and development will destroy the habitat of these creatures. Development will have an adverse impact on the Grade 2* Listed Berkswell Windmill. The proposal for medium density housing is not in keeping with the existing character of housing. The proposal for an unnecessary bypass and the moving of the Green Belt boundary will destroy a great swathe of our open countryside forever.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]		Again, given the need for additional housing, the site appears suitable.
Q06	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		This site is adjacent to the Berkswell Windmill which is a building of national significance.
Q06	Mr H Keene [4806]		Lack of a phasing plan to show how growth will be managed across the settlement, alongside the construction of HS2. Primary school is full with no further capacity until new school is provided, and public transport is inadequate with infrequent services. No assessment of highway infrastructure has been undertaken to show how it will cope until a by-pass is provided. No ecological assessments have been published.
Q06	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		Plan is supposed to avoid adding population in areas without transport infrastructure and local employment. Balsall Common is specifically identified as lacking in local services and in local employment. No plans are given for new business premises.
Q06	Mr J Stanley [4786]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Mr John Wilson [3890]		Greenfield site in green belt/Meriden Gap that Mayor has pledged to protect. Performs poorly in sustainability appraisal. Area is rich in wildlife. No plans for nature reserves, unlike the other sites at Frog Lane/Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable and poor accessibility will exacerbate congestion. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting residents amenity and the numerous species of local wildlife.
Q06	Mr Julian Henwood [5411]		This site is on greenfield land and is next to the charming Berkswell Windmill. The development of this site would destroy the countryside feel of the windmill.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mr K Hazelwood [6239]		The area is rich in wildlife. . As there are no plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. There is also the danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. . Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Mr K Millican [4779]		The area is rich in wildlife. . As there are no plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. There is also the danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. . Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Mr Keith Tindall [3020]		The large take of Green Belt land is disproportionate to the number of houses able to be built and its impact on the heritage site of the Windmill has not been fully assessed. The site is also a considerable distance from local amenities and is therefore unsustainable in terms of travel, leading to more car usage and congestion in what is already a congested area, placing further pressure on the local infrastructure
Q06	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		Do not support the selection of this site ahead of others given both the disproportionate impact on local green belt amenity and specifically the impact on a Grade 2 listed heritage asset. Amount of land to be taken out of green belt is far greater than that required for the volume of houses proposed, suggesting a greater volume of housing will be proposed at a later stage in the planning process. Only land required for the final planned development should be released. Poorly located for transport and schools, necessitating car based travel. Safety concerns associated with junction of Windmill Lane/A452.
Q06	Mr Leigh Mayers [3124]		The housing proposed will be far too densely populated for the size of land and the surrounding area. The proposed housing will detract from the historic windmill and ruin the historic site
Q06	Mr Leslie Noble [3503]		This is a poor site because it is too far away from the village amenities and resident will drive to the village centre to use it. It is also too far away from the railway station and again residents would drive to an already very busy station car park. This site further extends the village unnecessarily. The current development in this site was a mistake and should not have been approved.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mr P Phillips [4798]		The area is rich in wildlife. . As there are no plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. There is also the danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. . Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Mr P Greasley [4813]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise
Q06	Mr Paul Joyner [3573]		Bounded site, contained. Although I do have significant concerns about the plans ability to sustain the presence of Great crested newts
Q06	Mr R A Smith [4782]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise
Q06	Mr Richard Davis [5665]		1. There is a temptation in the future to for Solihull to join up with Coventry destroying the gap, 2. The housing near to Windmill Lane will increase the use of cars to the village centre 3. It is not desirable to have modern housing near the old windmill

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mr Ronald Handfield [3028]		Our home is off Windmill Lane, which is already very busy at peak periods acting as a rat run to avoid the traffic on the Kenilworth Road. At peak periods that Kenilworth Road traffic queues from Everson's fuel depot to get through the Village. Waste Lane/Hob Lane are used to access Coventry or University, yet are unsuitable. Will encourage more commuting as public transport infrequent and little parking at station. Area has suffered from noise/piling for existing developments. Impact on wildlife. Unfair concentration of growth in this area.
Q06	Mr S C Howles [6237]		The area is rich in wildlife. . As there are no plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. There is also the danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. . Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Mr T N Walton [4817]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise
Q06	Mr Tony Mann [5612]		Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise
Q06	Mr William Cairns [3206]		Area has already suffered development and does not have a high green belt rating, it is difficult to defend but at its extremity it is getting remote from the centre of the village. It could nevertheless be attractive to potential residents because of its rural outlook. However Windmill Lane has no pavements and is a busy cut through used by cars and commercial vehicles.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs C M Stradling [6292]		<p>Impact on operation and historic importance of the windmill. Disproportionate increase in development compared to other areas. No recognition of strategic importance of Green Belt. No indication of timing and how the growth proposed will be managed especially in relation to the construction of HS2. The village does not meet criteria for 'High frequency' public transport. Impact on wildlife and no ecological assessment within the evidence. Primary School is full. SA is questionable. Masterplan does not demonstrate how the site will function. Future road network within and around the site not adequately considered. Density will not respect local character.</p>
Q06	Mrs E A Seal [4814]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Mrs J Bliss [4803]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Mrs A Hazelwood [6240]		<p>The area is rich in wildlife. . As there are no plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. There is also the danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. . Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting the numerous species of local wildlife</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs Anya Schofield [5921]		The preparations for HS2 have affected a much wider area than originally suggested. Our day to day lives are significantly affected by the current HS2 work - specifically - frequent road closures and diversions affecting travel plans, constant heavy traffic affecting our roads and daily routine and walking paths closed and diverted. This will only worsen as HS2 work progresses. These plans centre on the area of Balsall Common most impacted by HS2. Layering onto this work to build houses and related infrastructure in this area would make our daily routine unbearable.
Q06	Mrs B Stanley [4785]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Mrs Barbara Hedley [5519]		The green belt boundary would be better if aligned with the footpath from the Windmill to Kenilworth Road. This would prevent longer views of the Windmill being obscured further, and maintain the rural character of that area. The southern point of this parcel reaches too far, and would mean that the village boundary steps substantially further south along the Kenilworth Road.
Q06	Mrs C Cavigan [4810]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs Caroline Gooding [3218]	Mrs Caroline Gooding [3218]	I object owing to the fact that the location of the site is too far removed from the central amenities. This in turn will cause more traffic on the roads, which the village cannot cope with and which will endanger the lives of pedestrians. The bypass should be built first before any further development. As soon as development begins, the wildlife will flee! This should remain greenbelt land and the wildlife should be protected by the Council. Assuming the development goes ahead, the trees on the northern boundary bordering the extension to Kelsey Court should be protected.
Q06	Mrs Debbie Gill [5393]		This site should not be considered for housing due to the following - Too far away from local shops and railway station Not a large enough site to include school etc. Too close to very busy Birmingham Road giving danger for more vehicles accessing this road from housing estate. Too close to historic Windmill in Windmill Lane Already has a new housing estate nearby recently constructed which proved not suitable for affordable homes as too far away from Railway station etc. Windmill Lane not suitable for access as a narrow country lane.
Q06	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Development should not take place opposite the historical Windmill.
Q06	Mrs Elspeth Hamilton [5052]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Mrs Gillian Tomkys [4787]		The area is rich in wildlife. . As there are no plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. There is also the danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. . Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting the numerous species of local wildlife

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs H Brookes [4795]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Mrs Helen Dean [2920]		Medium/High density housing currently proposed in the masterplans is not in harmony with the existing low density housing within this area. The masterplan must be reviewed to ensure that any new development is in harmony with the existing local character of the area. There have also been concerns raised by existing residents within this area re. Construction methods used by developers of the Elysian Fields site. Impact and disruption on existing residents must be minimised during this period of construction.
Q06	Mrs Helen Dean [2920]		Medium/High density housing currently proposed in the masterplans is not in harmony with the existing low density housing within this area. The masterplan must be reviewed to ensure that any new development is in harmony with the existing local character of the area. There have also been concerns raised by existing residents within this area re. Construction methods used by developers of the Elysian Fields site. Impact and disruption on existing residents must be minimised during this period of construction.
Q06	Mrs Helen Goodwin [4636]		Not enough road structure. not enough infrastructure for the whole area.
Q06	Mrs J A Gledhill [4811]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs J A Howles [6236]		The area is rich in wildlife. . As there are no plans to include nature reserves, unlike the other two greenfield sites at Frog Lane and Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. There is also the danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. . Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	Mrs J Carpenter [4796]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise
Q06	Mrs J E Smith [4781]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise
Q06	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		Many reasons why site is unsustainable. Particularly concerned about ecological impact on area of High Habitat distinctiveness. This has not been respected in concept masterplans, e.g. should have 30m buffer around woodland. Council's proposed solution based on biodiversity offsetting rather than preserving habitats. There are alternative sites which are smaller, with higher sustainability score and lower ecological value

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs Jennifer K Darby [6284]		<p>Site is greenfield, and within the green belt in the Meriden Gap. Development would create the narrowest gap yet so residents do not understand why the site is being included. Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site performs very poorly in the SA (9 negatives and only 2 positives), is not accessible, you would need to drive to access shops, the medical centre, train station and primary school, and development. Area is rich in wildlife and as there are no plans to include nature reserves like at the other two sites the habitat and feeding grounds will be destroyed. Light pollution from street lights will have a detrimental impact. Access to the road network is unsuitable via two points, the Kenilworth Road and Windmill Lane which is already turning into a rat run. Development will impact on Grade II* listed Berkswell Windmill opposite. Would impact on existing residents, in some parts medium density housing is proposed with no green buffer to preserve visual amenity and there will be an impact from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]		<p>I do not support the selection of this site ahead of others given both the disproportionate impact on local green belt amenity and specifically the impact on a Grade 2 listed heritage asset.</p> <p>Amount of land proposed to be taken out of greenbelt is far greater than that required for the volume of houses proposed, so only land required for development should be released.</p> <p>Site is well away from transport and educational amenities which will of necessity increase vehicle flow within the village and increase safety concerns on the exiting of traffic from Windmill Lane to A452</p>
Q06	Mrs K Drakes [4793]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs L Keene [4800]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Mrs Leslie Eustace [4792]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Mrs M Edmonds [4804]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Mrs Natalie File [5297]		I would highly recommend further consultation with other residents who have recently purchased and moved to Meer Stones Road.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs P Green [4790]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites were put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt in the Meriden Gap which the Mayor and leader of the Council has pledged to protect. Site performs very poorly in SA, it stretches out far from the village boundary so it would be necessary to drive to shops, the medical centre, train station and primary school. Area is rich in wildlife and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill. Road access is unsuitable on Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane, already a rat run. Otherwise traffic will have to cut through Meer Stones Road Estate. Development would impact on residents as there is green buffer to preserve existing visual amenity, and from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Mrs Rita Perks [4805]		<p>Site is greenfield, and within the green belt in the Meriden Gap. Development would create the narrowest gap yet so residents do not understand why the site is being included. Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site performs very poorly in the SA (9 negatives and only 2 positives), is not accessible, you would need to drive to access shops, the medical centre, train station and primary school, and development. Area is rich in wildlife and as there are no plans to include nature reserves like at the other two sites the habitat and feeding grounds will be destroyed. Light pollution from street lights will have a detrimental impact. Access to the road network is unsuitable via two points, the Kenilworth Road and Windmill Lane which is already turning into a rat run. Development will impact on Grade II* listed Berkswell Windmill opposite. Would impact on existing residents, in some parts medium density housing is proposed with no green buffer to preserve visual amenity and there will be an impact from construction noise.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs Sharon Lindop [6163]		<p>Development of the site will further narrow the Meriden Gap. Sustainability of site scores very poorly (9 negatives and 2 positives) The site is poorly positioned for residents to access village amenities such as schools and medical facilities, train station and primary school. Road access to and from the site is restricted. This would result in drivers from 280 dwellings (including Meer Stones Road residents) trying to access the road network from two points south of the village, Kenilworth Road and Windmill Lane, increasing congestion in the village centre as many commuters attempt to access the motorway network north of the village. The area is rich in wildlife such as owls, red kites, woodpeckers, deer, hawks, numerous insects, bats, amphibians and the protected Great Crested Newts and development will destroy the habitat of these creatures. Construction of new housing would require pile driving, the impact being relentless noise and vibrations on local residents during the building process. Development will have an adverse impact on the Grade 2* Listed Berkswell Windmill. The proposal for medium density housing is not in keeping with the existing character of housing. There is no green buffer to preserve visual amenity. Balsall Common is already under significant stress from HS2. The proposal for an unnecessary bypass and the moving of the Green Belt boundary will destroy a great swathe of our open countryside forever.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]		<p>Site is greenfield, and within the green belt in the Meriden Gap. Development would create the narrowest gap yet so residents do not understand why the site is being included. Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site performs very poorly in the SA (9 negatives and only 2 positives), is not accessible, you would need to drive to access shops, the medical centre, train station and primary school, and development. Area is rich in wildlife and as there are no plans to include nature reserves like at the other two sites the habitat and feeding grounds will be destroyed. Light pollution from street lights will have a detrimental impact. Access to the road network is unsuitable via two points, the Kenilworth Road and Windmill Lane which is already turning into a rat run. Development will impact on Grade II* listed Berkswell Windmill opposite. Would impact on existing residents, in some parts medium density housing is proposed with no green buffer to preserve visual amenity and there will be an impact from construction noise.</p>
Q06	Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]		<p>Concept Masterplan</p> <p>Inaccuracies and discrepancies in evidence used. Accesses unsustainable in advance of by-pass and rigorous transport assessment required. Inadequate protection for protected species. Fails to adequately reflect ecological assessment. Proposal to offset biodiversity rather than conserve on site as with Sites 1 and 2 is unacceptable. Density and lack of green buffer does not respect local character or residential amenity. Lack of assessment of impact on Windmill from affect on prevailing wind.</p>
Q06	Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]		<p>Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Extends further south than sites that SLP Inspector allowed. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise. Development would be neither efficient nor effective use of land. Identified as a mineral safeguarding area for coal. Inaccuracies in SA, SHELAA and Green Belt Assessment, and cannot stand up to scrutiny.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Ms Anne Stewart [5464]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Ms Jennifer Cayley [5598]		Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Ms Joanne Bellamy [5599]		Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Ms Kat Mann [5614]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Ms Natalie Moss [5314]		I support the development but do not support the developer proposal of gaining access through the existing Elysian Garden development. Its already very busy and hard to get out onto the Kenilworth road. The access would also go along the front of my house (No 43) which was not identified as potential development when I purchased.
Q06	Ms Wendy Gault [6134]		Failure to robustly study alternatives with the resultant removal from greenbelt an area which has significant ecological factors and resultant significant destruction of the setting of a historic windmill (working). The windmill is recognised as being of significant historic value which the site selection takes no account of.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		It is considered this site is poorly related to employment facilities and very intrusive into the openness of the Green Belt.
Q06	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		It is considered this site is poorly related to employment facilities and very intrusive into the openness of the Green Belt.
Q06	Professor David Walton [3795]		Scale/distribution of growth not equitable, settlement being concreted over and green space not being protected. Massive infilling of green space around Balsall Common will shrink green belt in this part of the Meriden Gap to little more than a few fields. Loss of green belt despite pledges from Mayor to protect. No Ecological Assessments made available to public, and hard to know why some sites in Balsall Common score so poorly for sustainability and other key criteria. Area is rich in wildlife/birds/insects/bats/amphibians and even deer. Previous building in the vicinity a sign that village has already made a positive contribution.
Q06	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the build rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan, as demonstrated by the adjacent Bellway scheme.
Q06	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan. This is particularly important for affordable housing, and our Client's site has the ability to deliver a 100% affordable housing scheme within the early years of the Plan period.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the assumed built rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Our Client's land is available now and can be delivered early in the Plan period.
Q06	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's - site 416) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q06	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We agree with the identification of the Balsall Common sites given the sustainable nature of the settlement. However as above, it is clear that employment land will be required
Q06	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, such as Site 1. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan
Q06	Rebecca Clare [3956]		Greenfield site in green belt/Meriden Gap that Mayor has pledged to protect. Performs poorly in sustainability appraisal. Area is rich in wildlife. No plans for nature reserves, unlike the other sites at Frog Lane/Barrett's Farm, so the habitat/feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable and poor accessibility will exacerbate congestion. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting residents amenity and the numerous species of local wildlife

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		No. The proposal is a poor strategic decision, it being too far from the centre. There is significant ecological impact the development of this site. The Green Infrastructure map Habitat Distinctiveness 2016 shows that this is an area of High Habitat distinctiveness. These have not been referenced to the masterplans particularly with regard to the 30m buffer around woodland. Solihull's solution seems to be around off setting rather than preserving habitats. There are other smaller sites that have a higher sustainability scoring and a lesser ecological value than Site 3.
Q06	Richard Lloyd [2616]		Although it is a less valuable part of the Green Belt, the site is an inaccessible location with poor housing yield due to ecological factors. It is clearly outside walking distance of all the facilities in the village of Balsall Common, and the resulting growth in vehicle traffic will have a major impact on the A452/ B4101 cross-roads and traffic lights. The masterplan should include provision of a footway southwards along the A452 to link with Public Footpath M181 through the site.
Q06	Richard Onions [4280]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Richborough Estates [3816]	Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]	12. Richborough Estates does not formally object to the allocation proposed at Barratt's Farm but notes the multitude of land ownerships and the required high level of infrastructure investment that may act as a constraint to the expedient delivery of new homes. It would, therefore, be entirely a logical for the self-contained site at Frog Lane to come forward at the earliest opportunity to provide some housing at Balsall Common early in the plan period.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Roger Howles [6238]		Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health. Site is greenfield/green belt and should be protected as Mayor has pledged. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible, and development will harm listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife. Road access is unsuitable. Development would impact on residents as no green buffer, and from construction noise.
Q06	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is relevant to Site 3. Although endeavouring to provide a firm and defensible Green Belt boundary the site becomes increasingly remote from the settlement in accessibility terms and produces a somewhat contrived, insensitive and illogical addition to Balsall Common which could result in a visually unattractive entrance into the settlement from the South.
Q06	Seamus Maguire [5946]		see BARRAGE letter
Q06	Sheila Cooper [2560]		Errors in site assessment and failure to investigate alternatives. Green belt take is disproportionate to housing proposed due to restrictions to protect Great-Crested Newts. Concept Masterplan significantly underestimates impact on Listed Windmill and its setting, including free-flow of wind, compared with listed buildings on other sites. Site is an unacceptable distance from the Village Centre/station/Doctors Surgery, is outside the desirable distance to nearest local schools, and will be highly car-dependent/unsustainable. Two areas identified as of ecological importance and should be protected, impact on protected species and offsetting unacceptable. Impact on Windmill Lane, traffic safety and amenity of existing residents.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Simon Clare [3953]		Greenfield site in green belt/Meriden Gap that Mayor has pledged to protect. Performs poorly in sustainability appraisal. Area is rich in wildlife. No plans for nature reserves, unlike the other sites at Frog Lane/Barrett's Farm, the habitat and feeding grounds for these creatures will be destroyed. Danger of light pollution from street lights having a detrimental effect on nocturnal creatures. Access unsuitable and poor accessibility will exacerbate congestion. Such invasive work in the vicinity of the Berkswell Windmill also risks causing long-term damage to this historic monument as well as disrupting residents amenity and the numerous species of local wildlife
Q06	SPAB Mills (Sophie Martin) [3912]		the windmill is an irreplaceable resource, a rare surviving example of the local style of tower mill retaining all of its internal machinery. Following recent extensive repairs - a substantial share of which were publically funded - the mill has successfully been returned to full working order. In addition to concerns about the likely visual impact of development on the setting of Berkswell Windmill, the Mills Section is concerned that development on the scale indicated in the Plan could damage the mill's ability to function fully in the future. Development must be regarded as causing substantial harm to the heritage asset.
Q06	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	This site appears to an illogical extension to the settlement, when considered in its wider context with listed buildings and main services and should therefore not be allocated.
Q06	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is relevant to Site 3. Although endeavouring to provide a firm and defensible Green Belt boundary the site becomes increasingly remote from the settlement in accessibility terms and produces a somewhat contrived, insensitive and illogical addition to Balsall Common which could result in a visually unattractive entrance into the settlement from the South.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Sylvia Walton [6203]		<p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites were put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. This is not a fair distribution particularly as the village will have to deal with HS2. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p> <p>Site is greenfield/green belt in the Meriden Gap and should be protected as the Mayor and Leader of the Council has pledged. It would create the narrowest gap between settlements do not understand why it is being included. Site performs very poorly in SA, is not accessible because it stretches so far from the village boundary and therefore people would need to drive to shops, medical centre, train station and primary school. Development would harm the Grade II* listed Berkswell Windmill and adversely affect wildlife including owls, red kites. Woodpeckers and protected Great Crested Newts . Road access is unsuitable either onto Windmill Lane opposite Hob Lane or through Meer Stones Road estate - this is already turning into a rat run. Development would impact on current residents, in some parts medium density housing is proposed with no green buffer to preserve visual amenity. Construction noise and vibration will affect residents and could cause long term damage to Berkswell Windmill.</p>
Q06	The International Molinological Society (Mr Willem Van Bergen) [5701]		<p>The characteristic view of the mill over the fields would be lost forever. The flow of air to the mill would be fatally damaged.</p>
Q06	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Doubts about the likelihood of comprehensive development and deliverability of some of the proposed allocations particularly when complex land assembly issues are highlighted. This is relevant to Site 3.</p> <p>Although endeavouring to provide a firm and defensible Green Belt boundary the site becomes increasingly remote from the settlement in accessibility terms and produces a somewhat contrived, insensitive and illogical addition to Balsall Common which could result in a visually unattractive entrance into the settlement from the South.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q06	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		The Ecology Assessment (Jan 2017) identified significant ecological features; marshy grassland and pond. In addition there is a known population of Great Crested Newts near to the site; they are a protected species and will need mitigation. Currently neither concept plan retains all the ecological features recommended within the Ecology Assessment (2017); we therefore recommend that the SMBC Concept Plan is amended to show the semi-improved grassland to the centre, south of the site as being retained as natural open-space.
Q06	Wendy Cairns [4226]		Green belt rating is low but is getting a little remote from centre of village at its furthest point. Windmill Lane has no pavements and can be busy as a cut through so traffic management is important. Side of site on Kenilworth Road is already part developed. it has the advantage for residents looking for a rural outlook

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
	Balsall Common		
Q07	Andrea Baker [3471]		Balsall Common is already being subjected to far more new houses per capita of the existing development, without the need to destroy more of our farm land and green belt.
Q07	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>No clearly defined physical feature along eastern boundary, and site does not follow field boundaries. Reliance on bypass line problematic, no evidence that route/funding agreed. Line likely to be further east so could not provide boundary.</p> <p>Low level of accessibility, Sustainability Appraisal identifies only 3 positive v 6 negative (2 significant) effects.</p> <p>Only one third of site is brownfield, the eastern part of the site makes the highest possible contribution towards the Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Should not be priority 3, but 8 for brownfield element and 10 for remainder according to Q07, therefore unsuitable for allocation.</p>
Q07	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		<p>Support building on brownfield sites and part of site included on BLR. Object to inclusion of significant area of greenfield/green belt, as evidence supports alternatives that will not impact on openness, such as Sites 1/43 bounded by roads.</p> <p>Site beyond acceptable distance to centre/surgery/station and outside desirable distance to schools, will be highly car dependent and unsustainable.</p> <p>Recommend exclusion of greenfield element other than for public open space which could remain in green belt. Suggest adopt approach as per Site 22 in SLP2013.</p> <p>Paragraph 113 is untrue as by-pass will not be within 200m of proposed boundary of Site so inclusion of greenfield land not justified. Greater part of Site in higher performing green belt parcel in GBA.</p>
Q07	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		Building on brownfield sites is preferable even if it currently sits in Green Belt.
Q07	Carole Beattie [5601]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q07	Christopher Fellows [6118]		<p>Call for Sites reference 170 has low accessibility, is high performing in GBA, and Sustainability Appraisal findings 3 positive (1 significant), 8 neutral and 6 negative (2 significant). Yet site is priority 3 in Step 1, and rated as green in Step 2 despite detached location and lack of clear firm green belt boundaries, which means could only be considered as part of a larger site.</p> <p>Call for Sites 320, which includes Site 170, is similarly rated despite lack of clear firm green belt boundaries.</p>
Q07	Councillor D Bell [2235]		Yes to being included as used as part brownfield.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		I appreciate that this site is new and has had less opportunity to have as much detail added to the plans. It is exacerbated by confusion of masterplans for Site 21 and 23 in the Masterplans document. That said, the masterplans are unclear as to where access will be from, where the HS2 line will go, incomplete legends on the masterplan. All in all, it is insufficient information to elicit valuable feedback. This should be rectified before the next version of the Local Plan.
Q07	Eileen Lamb [5709]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q07	Ferdous Gossain [5606]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q07	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The site assessment document states: a) "..... part high (highest) performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment and would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary to the east. b) "Site has a low level of accessibility....." and c) "Could be considered subject to provision of clear firm green belt boundaries". d) "Development should preferably be on land that is more highly accessible, and/or performs least well in Green Belt terms and/or provides strong defensible boundaries". Allocation is reliant on the building of a bypass and the assembly of land outside the site allocation. Hardly glowing commentary for an allocation.
Q07	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	no clearly defined physical feature along eastern boundary, and site does not follow field boundaries. Reliance on bypass line problematic, no evidence that route/funding agreed. Line likely to be further east so could not provide boundary. Low level of accessibility, Sustainability Appraisal identifies only 3 positive v 6 negative (2 significant) effects. Only one third of site is brownfield, the eastern part of the site makes the highest possible contribution towards the Green Belt purposes. Should not be priority 3, but 8 for brownfield element and 10 for remainder according to Q07, therefore unsuitable for allocation.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Izumi Segawa [5872]		Building on all available land means that the British countryside is losing to yet more ugly houses. If you look at the town itself, which is currently quite grotty, there is more opportunity for (better) development - above/behind shops/unnecessarily large car park by Co-op. Instead of choosing the easy option of building on greenbelt and farmland, you should use more imagination to maximise the use of the existing town. There is a need for more accommodation but building hundreds of individual houses sounds very inefficient. If you need to tackle the housing deficiency, build more flats in the town centre.
Q07	Jean Kelly [5684]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q07	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	No clearly defined physical feature along eastern boundary, and site does not follow field boundaries. Reliance on bypass line problematic, no evidence that route/funding agreed. Line likely to be further east so could not provide boundary. Low level of accessibility, Sustainability Appraisal identifies only 3 positive v 6 negative (2 significant) effects. Only one third of site is brownfield, the eastern part of the site makes the highest possible contribution towards the Green Belt purposes.
Q07	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	We consider there has been an inappropriate designation of the site as brownfield land. It is therefore considered that any agricultural buildings within this site should therefore not be classed as brownfield. We note in relation to the Green Belt impacts that the site currently: Performs a more important role than Grange Farm overall (in GB terms) It would result in unrestricted sprawl- lack of a strong and defensible boundary It is unclear why the site is preferred to Grange Farm which is less important in Green Belt terms and often more compact (less sprawling) form of development.
Q07	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	No clearly defined physical feature along eastern boundary, and site does not follow field boundaries. Reliance on bypass line problematic, no evidence that route/funding agreed. Line likely to be further east so could not provide boundary. Low level of accessibility, Sustainability Appraisal identifies only 3 positive v 6 negative (2 significant) effects. Only one third of site is brownfield, the eastern part of the site makes the highest possible contribution towards the Green Belt purposes.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>The site assessment document states:</p> <p>a) "..... part high (highest) performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment and would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary to the east.</p> <p>b) "Site has a low level of accessibility....." and</p> <p>c) "Could be considered subject to provision of clear firm green belt boundaries".</p> <p>d) "Development should preferably be on land that is more highly accessible, and/or performs least well in Green Belt terms and/or provides strong defensible boundaries".</p> <p>Allocation is reliant on the building of a bypass and the assembly of land outside the site allocation. Hardly glowing commentary for an allocation.</p>
Q07	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>no clearly defined physical feature along eastern boundary, and site does not follow field boundaries. Reliance on bypass line problematic, no evidence that route/funding agreed. Line likely to be further east so could not provide boundary.</p> <p>Low level of accessibility, Sustainability Appraisal identifies only 3 positive v 6 negative (2 significant) effects.</p> <p>Only one third of site is brownfield, the eastern part of the site makes the highest possible contribution towards the Green Belt purposes.</p> <p>Should not be priority 3, but 8 for brownfield element and 10 for remainder according to Q07, therefore inevitable for allocation</p>
Q07	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>no clearly defined physical feature along eastern boundary, and site does not follow field boundaries. Reliance on bypass line problematic, no evidence that route/funding agreed. Line likely to be further east so could not provide boundary.</p> <p>Low level of accessibility, Sustainability Appraisal identifies only 3 positive v 6 negative (2 significant) effects.</p> <p>Only one third of site is brownfield, the eastern part of the site makes the highest possible contribution towards the Green Belt purposes.</p>
Q07	Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]		<p>A brownfield site. It is good to see that SMBC have finally included brownfield sites after providing a non lawful rationale for their exclusion in the first place. A rationale that was repeated on 5th March 2019 and was put in writing before then. I cannot see why SMBC continue to use the mantra that paragraph 145 of the NPPF 2018 in some way restricts the redevelopment of brownfield land more than greenfield land when creating a local plan.</p>
Q07	Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]		<p>I support the brownfield element but not the greenfield element because that scores 12 in the Atkins Greenbelt assessment. There are also other sites with far lower greenbelt scores and closer to village amenities (sites 1 Springhill and 43) that should be chosen first. The use of this highly rated greenbelt land seems nerverse</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Mr Barrie Howarth [6132]		In appropriate development site. No local employment to walk to. Heavily dependent on car transport for work.
Q07	Mr David Varley [3385]		I would not be opposed to development on the Brownfield area, however, the green fields facing Waste Lane would be lost to the detriment of the green space.
Q07	Mr Gary Lindop [5433]		Including Site 21 Pheasant Oak Farm as an allocated site and moving the greenbelt boundary further east to the line of the proposed bypass serves no purpose other than to help earmark yet another site for future housing development in this area. The revised boundary would take Windmill Lane and part of Hob Lane out of the greenbelt and permanently destroy the rural character of these roads and the surrounding area. The greenbelt boundary should remain unchanged and the bypass should not be built.
Q07	Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]		The 'bypass' should be built to the west of Balsall Common. Access can be provided to the site from existing roads.
Q07	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		This is a very large site which if released from Green Belt would allow developers license to destroy huge swathes of countryside.
Q07	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		Plan is supposed to avoid adding population in areas without transport infrastructure and local employment. Balsall Common is specifically identified as lacking in local services and in local employment. No plans are given for new business premises.
Q07	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		As with Windmill Lane site the proposal places unnecessary additional pressure on green belt. I would support building on the brownfield element of the site. I do not understand the point about the by-pass forming a logical boundary for the site as this is well away from the core Pheasant Oak Farm site.
Q07	Mr Leslie Noble [3503]		A poor site, which will only extend the village and create future problems in defending the green belt.
Q07	Mr Paul Joyner [3573]		I object because when you take waste lane, windmill lane and Barratts Farm into account, then this is an almost continuous urbanisation of the south of the village. This highlights the problem of asking for consultation on separate plots of land rather than an integrated plan - the effects of approval of one or more plots can have a significant impact on the nature of the village, but on their own as single sites will not.
Q07	Mr Richard Davis [5665]		Increased car traffic to local shops
Q07	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		Only the Brownfield elements should be included

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Mr Richard Jones [5385]		Hob Lane is already a busy road with a primary school on it. It has no pavements, street lighting or any public transport. It is far away from the town centre and other local amenities. With the proposed house building on windmill Lane this will also make the junction of Hob Lane/windmill lane dangerous. The ongoing housing building in Burton green (Cromwell lane) will serve this area.
Q07	Mr Tony Mann [5612]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q07	Mr William Cairns [3206]		Starting to get remote from the centre but as it is poor green belt quality it ranks along with Windmill Lane. But it would bring more traffic on to Windmill lane which is always busy especially at peak times. Consideration of traffic flows need to be reviewed in this area. Development of brownfield sites is preferred to green belt.
Q07	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	no clearly defined physical feature along eastern boundary, and site does not follow field boundaries. Reliance on bypass line problematic, no evidence that route/funding agreed. Line likely to be further east so could not provide boundary. Low level of accessibility, Sustainability Appraisal identifies only 3 positive v 6 negative (2 significant) effects. Only one third of site is brownfield, the eastern part of the site makes the highest possible contribution towards the Green Belt purposes
Q07	Mrs Barbara Hedley [5519]		This area will be hard to resist where it is existing brownfield, but the business use of the site should be promoted at the village edge, especially as the increased population will include people looking for local employment. Windmill Lane should be retained as the village boundary right through to Waste Lane
Q07	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		Only the Brownfield part
Q07	Mrs Debbie Gill [5393]		This area of land provides countryside and walks for Balsall Common residents that is rapidly disappearing in other areas. It provides a boundary between Balsall Common and Kenilworth. Housing in this area would be very close to the HS2 with possible noise problems.
Q07	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Suitable land.
Q07	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		Building on brownfield sites is preferable even if it currently sits in Green Belt
Q07	Mrs Helen Goodwin [4636]		Very small area for a lot of house. It seems to be an approach to fill in all the "little Green Bits" up to any major lines? Feel as though it is a policy to think, oh there is some land, lets build on it!

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]		I support the proposals to build on the brownfield element of the site. However as with Windmill Lane site the disproportionate release of Green belt land places unnecessary additional pressure on green belt. Specifically, I do not understand the claim about the by-pass forming a logical boundary for the site as this is well away from the core Pheasant Oak Farm site and appears to be a placeholder for subsequent opportunistic development.
Q07	Mrs Kate Cooper [5378]		A development of this size is completely out of keeping with this rural/agricultural area. It is a good distance from the local schools, doctors, rail station and all other amenities and a car would be required for almost all journeys. The small amount of existing housing in this area are all larger detached properties or farms, so a housing estate would be very much out of line with the rest of the area.
Q07	Mrs Sharon Lindop [6163]		Including Site 21 Pheasant Oak Farm as an allocated site and moving the greenbelt boundary further east to the line of the proposed bypass serves no purpose other than to help earmark yet another site for future housing development in this area. Site quite some distance from village centre and would contribute towards urban sprawl. The revised boundary would take Windmill Lane and part of Hob Lane out of the greenbelt and permanently destroy the rural character of these roads and the surrounding area. The greenbelt boundary should remain unchanged and the bypass should not be built. Page 34 of the 2019 Local Plan (Site 23 Pheasant Oak Farm) states that any housing development in this particular area should 'safeguard the rural character of Hob Lane and Windmill Lane'. Whilst this statement is to be applauded, the proposal to move the greenbelt boundary east and thereby remove Windmill Lane and part of Hob Lane from the greenbelt surely contradicts this statement
Q07	Ms Jennifer Cayley [5598]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q07	Ms Joanne Bellamy [5599]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q07	Ms Kat Mann [5614]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Ms Wendy Gault [6134]		Building on brownfield sites thereby protecting the green belt is a sensible way to maximise preservation of the green belt, therefore the site selection is acceptable. However part of the site does involve removal of the green belt, and this coupled with distance to amenities means the site selection has issues that need to be addressed.
Q07	Peter Brett Associates LLP (Tim Coleby) [6198]		Agrees with allocation of site subject to it being extended to include the whole of the land within Barwood Land's control. There are a number of inaccurate or inconsistent statements in the consultation documents. * Document states site 21 is 12 ha in fact the red line is 9.56 *Suggests allocation will allow a strong and logical green belt boundary however the eastern boundary cuts through fields and does not follow existing physical features on the ground. *Council has used a general new density figure of 35dph yet allocates site 21 for only 100 dwellings which would not make efficient use of land. *The Barwood Land identified as site 414 in the site assessments document confirms that it is mainly brownfield and could make a contribution to new housing and is marked green suggesting it should be included in the allocation. Extending the allocation to include the Barwood Land and allocating for 350 dwellings would rectify the anomalies and provide for effective use of a largely brownfield site as a highly sustainable form of development. This would include a mix of house types as well as affordable housing. Significant environmental improvements would result from the removal of the sites existing buildings and enhancements to the millennium walk public right of way through the site. Opportunity for widespread use by future residents of existing footpath and cycle connections to adjoining proposed allocations Berkswell rail station and key facilities such as existing schools, the proposed new school within Barrett's Farm, village centre shops and the village health centre. A net gain in biodiversity would be achieved together with a network of well connected green infrastructure , open space and children's play.
Q07	Peter Brett Associates LLP (Tim Coleby) [6198]		We support the proposed allocation but consider that it should be increased in size and should be identified to accommodate some 350 dwellings.
Q07	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		It is considered this site is poorly related to employment facilities and very intrusive into the openness of the Green Belt.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the build rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan, as demonstrated by the adjacent Bellway scheme.
Q07	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan. This is particularly important for affordable housing, and our Client's site has the ability to deliver a 100% affordable housing scheme within the early years of the Plan period.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>The capacity of the allocation should be increased to at least 332 dwellings to reflect its relatively unconstrained nature and the need to make efficient use of land. Yes, we agree that this is a sustainable location for new housing on the edge of an urban area which has variety of facilities and services, including a station with regular links to Birmingham. The site is also adjacent to a bus stop with a regular service to Solihull and Coventry. Within the recent GL Hearn Greater Birmingham HMA Strategic Growth Study, Balsall Common is identified as a broad location for a strategic development given it is free from nationally significant constraints. Whilst the Council are yet to respond to the strategic growth study, the findings indicate the importance of Balsall Common in helping to address both Solihull's housing needs and Birmingham's unmet need. Smaller sites could help support strategic growth options such as Barratts Farm leading to a steady supply of deliverable housing in the early years of the plan. In terms of landscape character, the Balsall Common Eastern Fringe is a different landscape character area than the rest of the area to the north (Berkswell Landscape Character Area 4 Rural Centre, Sub Area 4D). The area to the east of Balsall Common (within the Eastern Fringe) is generally flat and is heavily influenced by the adjacent settlement. Development on this site is in accordance with the spatial strategy as Balsall Common is identified as a sustainable location for new growth. There are no constraints which can't be mitigated against. The site performs poorly in terms of both the Green Belt and landscape character and a more defined urban edge is needed. Compensatory measures will be provided to offset the loss of the Green Belt. In addition, the site has the potential to provide a financial contribution (e.g. via CIL) towards the bypass. As such, increasing the capacity of the site will further enhance the viability of the road. The site is well located in terms of walking and cycling to local services and facilities in Balsall Common, including a primary school. It is also adjacent to a bus stop for regular connections to wider employment opportunities.</p>
Q07	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's - site 416) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We agree with the identification of the Balsall Common sites given the sustainable nature of the settlement. However as above, it is clear that employment land will be required.
Q07	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, such as Site 1. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q07	Richard Lloyd [2616]		Part of the proposed site could be released from the Green Belt without undue harm, but there is no defensible boundary beyond the current buildings to the east of the site. The proposed by-pass is unlikely to be constructed in the foreseeable future and would pass well to the east. In addition, any development proposal needs to include space for the caravan storage, as this facility is still needed within the area. Overall, housing development should be restricted to the western half of the proposed site.
Q07	Richard Onions [4280]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q07	Roger Howles [6238]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q07	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The site assessment document states: a) "..... part high (highest) performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment and would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary to the east. b) "Site has a low level of accessibility....." and c) "Could be considered subject to provision of clear firm green belt boundaries". d) "Development should preferably be on land that is more highly accessible, and/or performs least well in Green Belt terms and/or provides strong defensible boundaries". Allocation is reliant on the building of a bypass and the assembly of land outside the site allocation. Hardly glowing commentary for an allocation.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q07	Sheila Cooper [2560]		Support building on Brownfield sites, including Brownfield area of Pheasant Oak Farm ONLY. Object to allocation of significant area of greenfield land due to impact on openness, when sites with lower impact not proposed. Site will be highly car dependent/unsustainable. Site justification in Para. 113 is deeply flawed as route of the proposed by-pass uncertain and will not come within 200 metres of the site boundary. Development of the Greenfield portion of this site would dramatically change the nature of the rural area.
Q07	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	Question whether site is deliverable given time required to relocate existing businesses. Given the commercial uses currently on the site, would this site be better as a commercial allocation?
Q07	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The site assessment document states: a) "..... part high (highest) performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment and would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary to the east. b) "Site has a low level of accessibility....." and c) "Could be considered subject to provision of clear firm green belt boundaries". d) "Development should preferably be on land that is more highly accessible, and/or performs least well in Green Belt terms and/or provides strong defensible boundaries". Allocation is reliant on the building of a bypass and the assembly of land outside the site allocation. Hardly glowing commentary for an allocation.
Q07	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The site assessment document states: a) "..... part high (highest) performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment and would result in an indefensible Green Belt boundary to the east. b) "Site has a low level of accessibility....." and c) "Could be considered subject to provision of clear firm green belt boundaries". d) "Development should preferably be on land that is more highly accessible, and/or performs least well in Green Belt terms and/or provides strong defensible boundaries". Allocation is reliant on the building of a bypass and the assembly of land outside the site allocation. Hardly glowing commentary for an allocation.
Q07	Wendy Cairns [4226]		It is a brownfield site and as such is preferred to green belt sites

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Balsall Common			
Q08	Andrea Baker [3471]		Balsall Common is already being subjected to far more new houses per capita of the existing development, without the need to destroy more of our farm land and green belt.
Q08	Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]		Have concerns over such large scale development in this rural area and the impact of traffic onto single track country lanes. All access/egress must be via the A452 roundabout near the George in the Tree.
Q08	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		Support as housing on brownfield land favoured, although large proportion of site not PDL. Residents likely to require high levels of parking, . Should consider emerging Balsall Parish NDP policies in master planning of site notably Policy NE5; mixed development with range of house types and sizes providing market accessible and affordable homes for younger age residents, opportunities for low carbon development, site contains/bounded by important natural features so existing trees and hedgerows must be protected, include at least 10% bungalows or other suitable accommodation for downsizing of mobile older residents, suitable measures to reduce aircraft noise exposure. Concept masterplan not acceptable. Substantial loss of trees and inadequate protection. No well-defined open space/blue infrastructure, or ecological study. Estate layout of medium density not integrated with or respectful of local character. Parish Council to provide ecological evidence and expects SMBC to take into account.
Q08	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		Berkswell PC would not normally comment on sites within Balsall Parish. However, the Council notes that this site is classed as brownfield and Berkswell PC supports the development of brownfield sites before greenfield sites.
Q08	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		Building on brownfield sites is preferable and although it is currently Green Belt it is not in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap.
Q08	Carole Beattie [5601]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q08	Christopher Fellows [6118]		Call for Sites reference 60 is moderately performing in Green Belt Assessment, with Sustainability Appraisal findings 5 positive (1 significant), 6 neutral and 6 negative, and is identified as priority 6 in Step 1. Commentary highlights indefensible boundaries, but concludes could be considered as part of a larger site and is rated green in Step 2.
Q08	Councillor D Bell [2235]		Yes to being included as used as part brownfield.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q08	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Whilst the site has potential for inclusion, the masterplans are not encouraging. The site has the potential to perform relatively well for active travel to UK Central, if appropriate cycling infrastructure is brought forward. That said, the site does little by way of providing Public Open Space, or ecological habitats. This would need to be addressed in emerging versions of the plans for the site.
Q08	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	I agree that Site 22 Trevallion Stud should be included as an allocated site. It has hard, defensible boundaries to limit further expansion into Green Belt land; it is well located to the village and its amenities, close enough that private vehicles may not always be used to reach the village centre. The Master Plan Report and Site Assessments for each parcel of land within it and the vicinity provide a clear justification for allocating this area of housing development, with the consequential need to release it from the Green Belt.
Q08	Diane Howell [5567]		This site contains a proportion of brownfield, however we will still lose greenspace. Vital that TPOs are applied to the mature oak trees and hedegrows retained where possible.
Q08	Dr & Mrs Robert & Jennifer Leeming [2933]		Housing density inappropriately high. Wootton Green Lane is single track and floods, access to A452 dangerous and already difficult, particularly at peak times. Access to Wootton Lane towards Barston and Knowle is also single track and already dangerous. Two ponds support wildlife (amphibia, birds and fish) which is being displaced in Balsall Common are not included in the plans presented? Extension of building at this side of the village encroaches on the Meriden Gap .
Q08	Eileen Lamb [5709]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q08	Ferdous Gossain [5606]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q08	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Land assembly issues are particularly relevant to this proposed allocation. Firm and defensible green belt boundaries would only be created when considered in a comprehensive manner which cannot be assured. The site is also identified as having high visual sensitivity in the Landscape Character assessment and from an assessment on site it is clearly evident that the land extends into open countryside impacting considerably on the openness of the Green Belt at this point.
Q08	Greig File [6082]		This seems to make more sense than the windmill lane proposal, although more details are needed to assess the environmental impact

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q08	Izumi Segawa [5872]		If you need to tackle the housing deficiency, build more flats in the town centre.
Q08	Jean Kelly [5684]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q08	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	We consider there has been an inappropriate designation of the site (totalling c.11ha) as brownfield land. We note in relation to the Green Belt impacts that the site: Performs a more important role than Grange Farm overall, in relation to the extent the site protrudes from Balsall Common. It would result in unrestricted sprawl. It is unclear why the site is preferred to Grange Farm which is less important in Green Belt terms and often more compact (less sprawling) form of development.
Q08	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Should be allocated. Strong defensible boundaries and not necessary to keep land permanently open. Brownfield site well served by public transport. Site should include additional land at 32 Wootton Green Lane as landowner has joined collective for site. Although moderately performing in GBA likely to be lower performing if smaller refined parcel had been defined. Concept masterplan shows additional 6 dwellings and proposals for open space. Concerned that SA (AECOM79) includes additional land not related to allocation, but not included separately as have other proposed allocations. Site including additional land should be subject to revised assessment in SA.
Q08	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Land assembly issues are particularly relevant to this proposed allocation. Firm and defensible green belt boundaries would only be created when considered in a comprehensive manner which cannot be assured. The site is also identified as having high visual sensitivity in the Landscape Character assessment and from an assessment on site it is clearly evident that the land extends into open countryside impacting considerably on the openness of the Green Belt at this point.
Q08	Mr & Mrs Hughes [5467]		The access point to the site is a single track lane, not enough capacity to support 300 extra cars. Only about 30% of the site is previously developed land so question why the whole site is being removed from the Green Belt. Concern that if this site goes forward, the village will become a small town, without the infrastructure to support the residents. <u>Construction disruption from HS2 and housing sites</u>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q08	Mr D Deanshaw [2226]		Wrong place for housing - too far from centre and does not address traffic issues in respect of access to Kenilworth Road. Highly suitable for commercial - e.g. hotel and sporting facilities, or even offices, which could bring jobs and more local trade. Balsall Common location 7 miles from Airport, NEC, UK Central. Housing could be relocated to Grange Farm.
Q08	Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]		Given the need for additional housig, I support the proposal.
Q08	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		I support this proposal. This site is largely brown field, has good access from the A452 and is reasonably close to facilities. It would also remove some pressure on numbers required in other more sensitive areas.
Q08	Mr Gerard Hudson [6080]		Wootton Green Lane narrows in places and after a short run of approx 30 houses becomes effectively a country lane. My understanding is that the area of Green Belt surrounding it will be reduced. The area is surrounded by unspoilt countryside and is popular with dog walkers and ramblers. I believe the proposal to build up to 300 houses nearby will negatively affect the area and encroach further into the countryside.
Q08	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		Plan is supposed to avoid adding population in areas without transport infrastructure and local employment. Balsall Common is specifically identified as lacking in local services and in local employment. No plans are given for new business premises
Q08	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		Plan is supposed to avoid adding population in areas without transport infrastructure and local employment. Balsall Common is specifically identified as lacking in local services and in local employment. No plans are given for new business premises
Q08	Mr Keith Tindall [3020]		This is overdevelopment in a rural environment, and concerning that an access road feeds onto Wootton Green Lane, a single track country lane. All access/egress from the site must be onto the A452 trunk road. It is also a considerable distance from the railway station, medical centre and other public amenities and therefore does not meet the SNBC sustainability requirements for such development.
Q08	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		I would support development of this brownfield site
Q08	Mr Leslie Noble [3503]		This site is near the station and would allow easy access into Birmingham and Coventry
Q08	Mr Paul Joyner [3573]		Brown field and non public access
Q08	Mr Richard Burgess [5518]		This site is too large and will destroy the rural nature of this part of the village. Wootton Green Lane is one of the few remaining roads in Balsall Common. The addition of so many new homes will be detrimental to the quality of life for current residents and those who currently use the road to safely cycle and walk. The two new proposed access points onto Wootton Green Lane will make it a busy thoroughfare and necessitate an upgrade from rural lane to urban road.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q08	Mr Richard Burgess [5518]		Wootton Green Lane is as the name suggest a rural road, one of the few remaining 8n the village. this proposed development will destroy its character for ever. The access points from the development into the lane will put far too much traffic on it for the safety of walkers etc who flock here daily because it is so peaceful a place.
Q08	Mr Richard Davis [5665]		Support
Q08	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		Brownfield sites should be built on first. However, the plan is unappealing. Although in Balsall Parish it would be improved if the ideas in the Berkswell NDP were adopted.
Q08	Mr Tony Mann [5612]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q08	Mr William Cairns [3206]		Concerns about ease of access on to the Kenilworth Road but would fit in well with a bypass to the west of Balsall Common.
Q08	Mr. John Peake [5850]		This area of historic pastureland should remain in the green belt, and is wholly unsuitable for housing development. Any past development of the Stud to include it as a Brownfield site indicates non-permitted development that SMBC should have been acted on contravenions. The site is on the extremity of the village and development, would contribute to A452 "sprawl" with a negative impact by increased vehicle use with pollution and be distant from services. There is some merit in additional housing site allocation at the Kenilworth end of the village up to a bypass construction at that point as a viable alternative
Q08	Mrs Barbara Hedley [5519]		There is already ribbon development along Wootten Green Lane, and the area is of limited landscape value. Nor will it be widely prominent as new development.
Q08	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		Brownfield should be developed first. Concept Masterplan Site plan is poor.
Q08	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Suitable land.
Q08	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		Building on brownfield sites is preferable and although it is currently Green Belt it is not in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap.
Q08	Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]		I support development of this brownfield site in priority to other greenfield sites
Q08	Ms Jennifer Cayley [5598]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q08	Ms Joanne Bellamy [5599]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q08	Ms Kat Mann [5614]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q08	Ms Wendy Gault [6134]		I am supporting the selection of this site on the basis it is a brownfield site.
Q08	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		It is considered this site is poorly related to employment facilities and very intrusive into the openness of the Green Belt.
Q08	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the build rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan, as demonstrated by the adjacent Bellway scheme.
Q08	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan. This is particularly important for affordable housing, and our Client's site has the ability to deliver a 100% affordable housing scheme within the early years of the Plan period.
Q08	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the assumed built rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Our Client's land is available now and can be delivered early in the Plan period.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q08	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's - site 416) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q08	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We agree with the identification of the Balsall Common sites given the sustainable nature of the settlement. However as above, it is clear that employment land will be required.
Q08	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, such as Site 1. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q08	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		The property called Stoneycroft has been submitted as additional housing land within the A452/Wootton Green Lane quadrant so the overall release of Trevallion Stud appears acceptable but even more so if land to the south at Grange Farm as well as north of Dengate Drive were also to be released as a large allocation west of Balsall Common. This would allow for proper provision for a large primary school and better centre for a large food store with parking and perhaps a western bypass or link road to pick up traffic.
Q08	Richard Lloyd [2616]		Proposed accesses onto the A452 and Wootton Green Lane are unacceptable. Access should be via roundabout and through the car park of the George in the Tree. Further land acquisition would be required. Provision should be made in the site for a north-south road, starting from the A452 and replacing one segment of Wootton Green Lane. This would provide access to other development sites on the west of Balsall Common and be an element of a western by-pass toward Fen End and the JLR works. Higher density housing could be used to provide the same number of units.
Q08	Richard Onions [4280]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q08	Roger Howles [6238]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q08	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Land assembly issues are particularly relevant to this proposed allocation. Firm and defensible green belt boundaries would only be created when considered in a comprehensive manner which cannot be assured. The site is also identified as having high visual sensitivity in the Landscape Character assessment and from an assessment on site it is clearly evident that the land extends into open countryside impacting considerably on the openness of the Green Belt at this point.
Q08	S Edwards [5827]	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	I believe that Site 22 Trevallion Stud should be included as an allocated site. In addition the Development Plan should include site 159 (of the initial consultation) within its allocation of land for housing purposes. This is located in the vicinity of the Trevallion Stud but falls outside the Master Plan boundary. Including Site 159, in the Development Plan but outside the Master Plan area for site 22 will allow a phased development of land in this area. Due to the brownfield nature of the site, bringing forward Site 159 before the remainder of Site 22 will be beneficial.
Q08	Sheila Cooper [2560]		I support the allocation of Brown Field Sites and, therefore welcome the addition of the Trevallion Stud on the allocation of sites.
Q08	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	The density of development appears to be at odds with the density of the surrounding area on the edge of this settlement, and does not accord with open space requirements. As a result, it is highly unlikely the site would be able to deliver 300 dwellings, particularly also given the existing woodland and trees on the site.
Q08	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Land assembly issues are particularly relevant to this proposed allocation. Firm and defensible green belt boundaries would only be created when considered in a comprehensive manner which cannot be assured. The site is also identified as having high visual sensitivity in the Landscape Character assessment and from an assessment on site it is clearly evident that the land extends into open countryside impacting considerably on the openness of the Green Belt at this point.
Q08	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Land assembly issues are particularly relevant to this proposed allocation. Firm and defensible green belt boundaries would only be created when considered in a comprehensive manner which cannot be assured. The site is also identified as having high visual sensitivity in the Landscape Character assessment and from an assessment on site it is clearly evident that the land extends into open countryside impacting considerably on the openness of the Green Belt at this point.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q08	Turley (Mr Neil Denison) [3477]	Turley (Mr Neil Denison) [3477]	The proposed allocation at Trevallion Stud is generally supported, although the incorporation of site ref 172 of the LPA's 'Site Assessment' document within the proposed allocation site (as shown on the Concept Masterplan drawing) is questioned, since that land area forms part of a separate land ownership, on which separate representations have been made by Turley in the 'Any Other Issues' Chapter. In our view site ref 172 should be removed from the Green Belt, but not allocated for housing.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Balsall Common			
Q09	Andrea Baker [3471]		Balsall Common is already being subjected to far more new houses per capita of the existing development, without the need to destroy more of our farm land and green belt.
Q09	Andrew King [2922]		If development is to be agreed, the above needs to be confirmed and the bypass needs to be built first so traffic congestion through the village can be kept to a minimum. No development of housing until HS2 is complete.
Q09	Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]		Brown Field development should always be a priority over Green Field, and as a Brown Field site we support its development.
Q09	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		Berkswell PC are pleased that SMBC have responded to consultation responses and included brownfield sites within the local plan. Therefore, the Council supports the inclusion of this site for medium/high density housing. Concept Masterplan Footpath access possible to station/surgery/Hall Meadow Road but will need improvement. If Hall Meadow Road becomes by-pass, suitable access across road will be required. Access to Lavender Hall Lane will need careful planning in conjunction with new HS2 bridge as existing access problematic.
Q09	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		Building on previously developed land is to be encouraged even if it currently sits in Green Belt.
Q09	Carole Beattie [5601]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.
Q09	Christopher Fellows [6118]		Call for Sites reference 9 identified as priority 3 in Step 1, despite proximity to railway line, HS2 and dangerous access adjacent railway bridge, and being high performing in Green Belt Assessment. It has more negative than positive effects in Sustainability Appraisal, yet it is rated green in Step 2.
Q09	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		As per my answer to Q8, the confusion over the sites in the Masterplan document and the scant detail mean that beneficial scrutiny will have to come after further information is supplied.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q09	Countryside Properties (UK) (Paul Shepherd) [6116]		Supports inclusion of site. Identification as a green site falling within priority 3 of Q02 is justified and fully supported. Land to the rear of LHF forms a small parcel of Green Belt that would be impacted by HS2. Site comprises of Brownfield land that is on the Brownfield land register. Site is enclosed by west coast mainline & in the future HS2- clearly defined features No functional reason why the land should remain Green Belt Balsall Common is identified as an excellent location for growth, as a sustainable settlement, offering a range of facilities and is well served by public transport links. Supportive of approach to amend green belt boundary. Land offers opportunity to provide wide range of homes including a substantial proportion of affordable homes. Development of site for a minimum of 60 dwellings is supported however greater degree of flexibility should be given to the number of dwellings to ensure efficient use of site. Masterplan currently shows a mix of low and medium housing rather than higher density to recognise sites changing context with HS2 which will greatly alter the sites immediate landscape context.
Q09	Diane Howell [5567]		However safe access onto lavender hall lane needs to be looked at.
Q09	Eileen Lamb [5709]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q09	Ferdous Gossain [5606]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q09	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The site assessment would not immediately suggest this site was suitable for allocation. It lies within the highest performing Green Belt Parcel and has high visual landscape sensitivity. If HS2 is built the site would lie in a narrow belt between two highly used railway lines, hardly an ideal situation for residential development. Site would lie outside the suggested firm and defensible Green Belt boundary east of Balsall Common, at odds with the implied development intentions. Being contaminated land its viability would come into question. Difficult to understand why this site is proposed for allocation.
Q09	Greig File [6082]		With the inevitable arrival of HS2 this could be an alternative to windmill lane that offers similar impact with more local benefits (proximity to centre, less impact on local traffic). Again more details are needed to assess the environmental impact <u>vs. other developments</u>
Q09	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		Although we acknowledge the SMBC Draft illustrative Concept Masterplan indicates how potential future development could respond to the affected heritage assets, it will be important to consider the local authority's completed Heritage Impact Assessment of this site, to inform the principle and without prejudice the <u>appropriate response</u>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q09	HS2 (Peter Attwell) [2776]		<p>High level references are made to the arrival of HS2 in the Borough, so no soundness concerns from a safeguarding planning perspective. Concept Masterplans should indicate extent of land that is subject to formal safeguarding directions.</p> <p>The site is referred to as site 21 in the 'Concept Masterplan' document. While this site is also affected by the HS2 safeguarding direction, it is noted that there is no mention of a potential need to phase this development within the plan-period in order to avoid conflict with HS2.</p>
Q09	Izumi Segawa [5872]		<p>If you need to tackle the housing deficiency, build more flats in the town centre.</p> <p>Obviously HS2 gives a good excuse to move the town boundary up to the line. Is HS2 allowed to go through towns at high speed? I doubt it. So high speed train will be not so high speed, which makes the whole exercise yet again completely pointless.</p>
Q09	Jean Kelly [5684]		<p>Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in finding alternative sites to build on.</p>
Q09	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	<p>We query the designation of the entire site as brownfield land</p> <p>We note in relation to the Green Belt impacts that the site until HS2 is implemented:</p> <p>Performs a more important role than Grange Farm overall, in relation to the impact on the Green Belt.</p> <p>It would result in unrestricted sprawl given the current lack of a strong and defensible boundary to the north of the site.</p> <p>It is unclear why the site is preferred to Grange Farm which is less important in Green Belt terms</p> <p>The site is promised on the defensible boundary of the HS2 line</p>
Q09	Michael Watkinson [3576]		<p>An appropriate brownfield site</p>
Q09	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>The site assessment would not immediately suggest this site was suitable for allocation. It lies within the highest performing Green Belt Parcel, site has high visual landscape sensitivity. If HS2 is built the site would lie in a narrow belt between two highly used railway lines, hardly an ideal situation for residential development. Site would lie outside the suggested firm and defensible Green Belt boundary east of Balsall Common, at odds with the implied development intentions. Being contaminated land its viability would come into question. Difficult to understand why this site is proposed for allocation.</p>
Q09	Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]		<p>It is good to see that SMBC have finally met their duty of including brownfield sites within the draft plan. It is a pity that SMBC failed to follow their own selection methodology in the first draft of the plan because it makes the process look predetermined.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q09	Mr Christopher McDermott [3693]		brownfield site
Q09	Mr D Deanshaw [2226]		No objection, but question road access - new bridge?
Q09	Mr Gary Lindop [5433]		Site 23 Lavender Hall Farm should be included as an allocated site because the location provides: Easy access for residents to the A45 and motorway network along the A452 without the need to pass through Balsall Common causing increased traffic congestion. A large enough area to incorporate facilities such as shops, and possibly a primary school. Easy access to the Balsall Common Healthcentre via Hallmeadow Road. Reduced infrastructure requirements compared to alternatives such as Barrets Farm. Less impact on existing residents.
Q09	Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]		Given the need for additional housing, I support the proposal.
Q09	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		I support this proposal. This small brown field site is in an area bounded by the west coast main line and HS2 which has little alternative use.
Q09	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		Plan is supposed to avoid adding population in areas without transport infrastructure and local employment. Balsall Common is specifically identified as lacking in local services and in local employment. No plans are given for new business premises
Q09	Mr Keith Tindall [3020]		Brown field development should take priority over Green Field sites. This is a Brown field site and I support its development.
Q09	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		I would support development of this brownfield site but work will be required to ensure safe access to Lavender Hall Lane, including creation of dedicated pedestrian routes. Some sort of pedestrian bridge over the existing railway and bypass would also be required to prevent the site being cut off from the rest of the village
Q09	Mr Leigh Mayers [3124]		I support this allocation of land as it is currently largely brownfield land or unused waste land
Q09	Mr Leslie Noble [3503]		This is green belt and should be defended
Q09	Mr Leslie Noble [3503]		Though this area is close to the village centre and near the train station, it should be rejected, to keep open spaces available to the housing in the area
Q09	Mr Michael Smitham [5283]		After living in there area for many years, and understand that there is a need for more houses, I'm on the firm belief that sites like Lavender Hall should be utilised first.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q09	Mr Paul Joyner [3573]		This stretch of land will be redundant, squeezed between Hs2 and the ring road, so limited development would be sensible - concept plan appears too dense. Access will also need to be given consideration, as access near Berkswell station will create congestion issues
Q09	Mr Richard Davis [5665]		Support
Q09	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		Brownfield sites should be developed first. The concept plan shows current footpaths as pedestrian access. These will need to be improved if they are to be viable for all weather use by pedestrians, cyclists and mobility scooter users. Ideally the non-vehicular access through the site could be used to improve non-vehicle access to Berkswell Village to access the school and church. Vehicle access onto Lavendar Hall Lane will need careful planning and review.
Q09	Mr Tony Mann [5612]		Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u>
Q09	Mr William Cairns [3206]		Sandwiching houses between two railways lines and close to a major road which likely to become the main A452 - What would be the quality of the environment for residents in this location, though it is brownfield land.
Q09	Mrs Barbara Hedley [5519]		This is already degraded land and could be put residential use. But as a wedge of land between the existing and new HS2 line, exceptional effort will be needed to ensure that good quality homes with adequate amenity, sound proofing and access to the main parts of the village are provided. Poor design could result in an isolated enclave. Good design could blend development with the existing fishing lakes, which should be retained and access improved as amenity space for <u>everyone</u>
Q09	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		Brownfield should be developed first. Vehicle access off Lavender Hall Lane needs care. Good/safe all weather access for walkers, cyclists and the disabled to <u>Berkswell and Balsall needs to be proided.</u>
Q09	Mrs Catherine Brown [5731]		Lavendar hall farm will be close to HS2. Its not an appropriate place to build <u>housing.</u>
Q09	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Suitable land.
Q09	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		Building on previously developed land is to be encouraged even if it currently sits in Green Belt.
Q09	Mrs Helen Goodwin [4636]		Seems a little more sensible for area, as near the railway line (and HS2?)

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q09	Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]		<p>I support development of this brownfield site but work will be required to ensure safe access to Lavender Hall Lane, including creation of dedicated pedestrian routes.</p> <p>Some sort of pedestrian bridge over the existing railway and bypass would also be required to prevent the site being cut off from the rest of the village</p>
Q09	Mrs Sharon Lindop [6163]		<p>Lavender Hall Farm should be included as an allocated site because the location provides:</p> <p>Easy access for residents to the A45 and motorway network along the A452 without the need to pass through Balsall Common causing increased traffic congestion.</p> <p>A large enough area to incorporate facilities such as shops, and possibly a primary school.</p> <p>Easy access to the Balsall Common Healthcentre via Hallmeadow Road.</p> <p>Reduced infrastructure requirements compared to alternatives such as Barratts Farm.</p> <p>Less impact on existing residents.</p>
Q09	Ms Jennifer Cayley [5598]		<p>Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u></p>
Q09	Ms Joanne Bellamy [5599]		<p>Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u></p>
Q09	Ms Kat Mann [5614]		<p>Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u></p>
Q09	Ms Wendy Gault [6134]		<p>I am supportive of the site in that it is a brownfield site but have significant issues with impact of potential bypass/access and also it will be sandwiched between 2 trainlines.</p>
Q09	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the build rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan, as demonstrated by the adjacent Bellway scheme.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q09	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites that have less land assembly issues that are available for development now are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan. This is particularly important for affordable housing, and our Client's site has the ability to deliver a 100% affordable housing scheme within the early years of the Plan period.
Q09	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and the assumed built rate will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Our Client's land is available now and can be delivered early in the Plan period.
Q09	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, for instance Barratts Farm (site 1), which has over 10 landowners within the allocation and relies on significant infrastructure for its delivery. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's - site 416) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q09	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We agree with the identification of the Balsall Common sites given the sustainable nature of the settlement. However as above, it is clear that employment land will be required.
Q09	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Whilst we agree with the spatial approach to development in Balsall Common, we would query whether there is evidence on the deliverability of some sites, such as Site 1. Evidence is required to demonstrate delivery and a housing trajectory will be crucial in the Regulation 19 Plan. Sites with less land assembly issues that are available for development now (such as our Client's) are much more deliverable in the early years of the Plan.
Q09	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		No - This site should be allocated for business use not residential. It is close to the centre but sandwiched between two train lines with HS2 to the north and In either case the narrow railway bridge which would need to be improved.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q09	Richard Lloyd [2616]		<p>Only if HS2 is constructed. Cancellation of HS2 would remove the defensible Green Belt boundary that is required.</p> <p>The opportunity should be taken to build at a higher density than shown on the masterplan.</p> <p>A key infrastructure requirement is the provision of a segregated route for walkers, cyclists and horse-riders This could connect with a SW-NE route parallel to Hall Meadow Road, linking with the existing Kenilworth Greenway.</p> <p>A new bridge for non-motorised users would be required across the Rugby and Birmingham Railway, possibly adjacent to the aqueduct over the railway, which only has pedestrian access for maintenance purposes.</p>
Q09	Richard Onions [4280]		<p>Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u></p>
Q09	Roger Howles [6238]		<p>Site suggested by residents as alternative to sites 2 and 3. The council would appear to be paying lip service to residents' concerns and efforts to assist in <u>finding alternative sites to build on.</u></p>
Q09	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>The site assessment would not immediately suggest this site was suitable for allocation. It lies within the highest performing Green Belt Parcel, site has high visual landscape sensitivity. If HS2 is built the site would lie in a narrow belt between two highly used railway lines, hardly an ideal situation for residential development. Site would lie outside the suggested firm and defensible Green Belt boundary east of Balsall Common, at odds with the implied development intentions. Being contaminated land its viability would come into question. Difficult to understand why this site is proposed for allocation.</p>
Q09	Sheila Cooper [2560]		<p>Support the allocation of Brownfield Sites and inclusion of this site.</p> <p>Concept Masterplan</p> <p>Text proposes medium/high-density housing, however, graphic ONLY shows medium/low-density housing. Clarification would be appreciated.</p> <p>Improved footpath access needed from site to station/medical centre/Village Centre and to Hall Meadow Road for access to the park/recreational facilities.</p> <p>If the proposed by-pass on Hall Meadow Road becomes a reality, consideration will need to be given to suitable and safe crossing for the new residents. Lavender Hall Lane access requires careful planning in conjunction with new HS2 bridge, as current access dangerous.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q09	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	Unclear whether existing businesses would be relocated. Nevertheless, the loss of employment generating uses appears to be at odds with the wider economic ambitions of the Council. The site would also be bounded on two sides by the railway line with what appears to be a limited buffer. This therefore raises concerns over amenity for future occupiers.
Q09	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The site assessment would not immediately suggest this site was suitable for allocation. It lies within the highest performing Green Belt Parcel, site has high visual landscape sensitivity. If HS2 is built the site would lie in a narrow belt between two highly used railway lines, hardly an ideal situation for residential development. Site would lie outside the suggested firm and defensible Green Belt boundary east of Balsall Common, at odds with the implied development intentions. Being contaminated land its viability would come into question. Difficult to understand why this site is proposed for allocation.
Q09	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The site assessment would not immediately suggest this site was suitable for allocation. It lies within the highest performing Green Belt Parcel, site has high visual landscape sensitivity. If HS2 is built the site would lie in a narrow belt between two highly used railway lines, hardly an ideal situation for residential development. Site would lie outside the suggested firm and defensible Green Belt boundary east of Balsall Common, at odds with the implied development intentions. Being contaminated land its viability would come into question. Difficult to understand why this site is proposed for allocation.
Q09	Wendy Cairns [4226]		While it is a poor quality green belt site it will be stuck between two railway lines and a road and may not be ideal for residential development

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Balsall Common			
Q10	Andrea Baker [3471]		<p>Balsall Common is a semi-rural village that has been severely neglected in terms of infrastructure development and improvement for more than a decade - members of staff from the Council often tell callers we are not even part of Solihull, and I have personally been told to ring Coventry City Council with issues about waste collection!</p> <p>The attraction of the area is its rurality, we are surrounded by wildlife, safe cycling routes and walks for families and dog lovers alike. These plans destroy the way of life the villagers have moved here for.</p>
Q10	Andrew King [2922]		Greenbelt is greenbelt for a reason. You are setting a dangerous precedence by taking out greenbelt willy nilly. What's the point in having greenbelt at all if you can just take it out whenever you want?
Q10	Annie Lutzy [6293]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Arta Golestani [5527]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q10	Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]		<p>We do not support this. The proposal is unjustified and will lead to uncontrolled piece meal development. Its removal from the green belt will therefore further erode the Meriden Gap by encouraging unsustainable development on it.</p> <p>It is also contrary to the Atkins Green Belt Report 2016 which rated the area's importance highly.</p>
Q10	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		<p>No justification given in the plan for such a step. There is a presumption in favour of sustainable development within the NPPF for land not within the green belt. The removal of green belt status as proposed for land south of Old Waste/Waste Lanes will remove all protection from development and result in unstructured, random development as individual sites are promoted for development through the normal planning system.</p> <p>Predominantly highly performing green belt in GBA of strategic importance to Meriden Gap, in maintaining separation of settlements and in providing setting for Windmill Support statement in Concept Masterplan that rural character of Hob Lane/Windmill Lane should be safeguarded, and best achieved by retaining green belt designation.</p> <p>Cannot understand logic of removing land from green belt without it being needed for housing or safeguarded for future needs. Suggest southern boundary formed by Waste Lane/Old Waste Lane, with Pheasant Oak Farm washed over or inset.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		<p>There is no justification for such a change, other than to provide land for a major development (which could eventually result in excess of 4000 homes) in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap. While this also may provide some of the revenue to build a by-pass the necessity for this, in this area, is not proven. It is unacceptable that smaller parcels of land will no longer have the protection of being in Green Belt. This could result in unstructured, random development as individual sites are promoted for development through the normal planning system.</p> <p>It is not prudent to release land from Green Belt especially in the 'Meriden Gap'. SMBC are its guardians and erosion must be resisted in this critical location. Land is being removed from Green Belt because of HS2. The west coast main line already runs through the area so there is no justification for such a reduction in the Meriden Gap.</p>
Q10	Bob Harris [5639]		Preservation of the Green Belt. I am strongly against the proposed dramatic reduction of the Green Belt in the whole Balsall Common area.
Q10	Carole Beattie [5601]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q10	Christopher Read [6267]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Colchurch Properties Ltd [4565]	Richard Brown Planning (Richard Brown) [4559]	<p>As mentioned the land between the current Draft Allocation eastern boundary and Kenilworth Greenway has the potential to deliver, post HS2, another 250 units (approx.) as part of a comprehensively masterplanned development for Barratt's Farm. As such, it should be usefully included within the Draft Allocation at this point and removed from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Mindful of meeting the needs of the wider HMA and an uplift to the housing requirement for Solihull it is considered that the inclusion of additional land between the current Draft Allocation eastern boundary and Kenilworth Greenway is an appropriate and logical location to meet additional housing needs in Solihull and Balsall Common through a comprehensive and sustainable development.</p>
Q10	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>Principle needs greater explanation for respondents.</p> <p>Mapping of sites needs to be provided in conjunction with question, to demonstrate that principle of change is effective and reassure community.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>Oppose to removal of washed over designation because it is useful in restricting the scale and density of redevelopment in Green Belt areas surrounding large towns and cities.</p> <p>In the area east of Balsall Common, removal of Green Belt status proposed for land south of Old Waste Lane and Waste Lane will remove the current level of control over development. This would result in unstructured, random development as individual sites are promoted for development.</p>
Q10	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>We oppose removal of 'washed over' designation because it is useful in restricting the scale and density of redevelopment in Green Belt areas surrounding large towns and cities. near large populations. . In low-density settlement areas, or dispersed settlement, the 'washed-over' designation ensure that Green Belt policy is maintained. This provides for limited infilling in a developed frontage, where new houses are permitted of a size and height of the existing development. But elsewhere new houses should not be significantly larger than those they replace.</p> <p>In the area east of Balsall Common, removal of Green Belt status proposed for land south of Old Waste Lane and Waste Lane will remove the current level of control over development. This would result in unstructured, random development as individual sites are promoted for development.</p> <p>The majority of the land in this parcel is broad area 4 and is scored at 12 in the Atkins Strategic Green Belt Area Assessment (2016). Only a very small area RP56 is found to make a limited contribution to the Green Belt. Therefore proposing to remove this land from the Green Belt goes against the AGBR that broad area 4 which states " The area covers a large part of Birmingham and Solihull to the West and Coventry to the East.....The area performs highly against all 4 purposes and makes an equal contribution to the preservation of the Meriden Strategic Gap and the setting and character of the Berkswell Conservation Area".</p>
Q10	Dave Acford [3857]		<p>Much of the proposed building will be on green field sites which will be detrimental to local wildlife and to how the local community are able to access that land, which improves their health and well-being.</p> <p>I understand that three brown field sites were put forward as alternatives for some of the green belt, but the council has just chosen to build on those as well.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	<p>Objection to scale of development in Balsall Common: 1,700 dwellings to a single rural village appears completely disproportionate. No discussion on how proposed new infrastructure such as school, bypass, station car park and improved public transport will be funded. No capacity study carried out for the area.</p> <p>Balsall Common will be acutely affected by HS2 - both in terms of the physical construction of the line and the disruption and uncertainty that this will bring; but also in terms of market desirability until such time as the line is constructed. Site 1 in multiple ownerships adding to complexity.</p>
Q10	Diane Howell [5567]		Greenbelt can be released at a later date, but once it's gone it is gone. My concern is tht as Coventry builds up to our boundary we are eroding the Meriden gap. And if our allocated housing numbers are increased, this land will be developed very soon.
Q10	Dominique McGarry [4414]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Dr Christine West [5726]		Contest the extent of Green Belt that must be sacrificed. Every option must be explored before Green Belt is removed.
Q10	Ella McGarry [4246]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet
Q10	Ferdous Gossain [5606]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q10	Francoise Read [6268]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>The proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary on the eastern side of Balsall Common will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common and its elevation in settlement hierarchy within the Borough with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation.</p> <p>Also, part of the proposed allocation sites and those areas not allocated for development lie within the highest performing area within the Green Belt Assessment.</p>
Q10	Izumi Segawa [5872]		<p>We are trying to leave as much valuable nature for the next generation. But the government is being an obstruction to achieve such a legacy.</p> <p>That's what the government is doing - destroying nature, encouraging people to drive more and pollute the air, lower the quality of life of people and leave nothing good for the children.</p> <p>If you need to tackle the housing deficiency, build more flats in the town centre.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Jean Kelly [5684]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Jeanette McGarry [4247]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet between settlements
Q10	John Boucher [4012]		I am concerned at the proposal to remove the status of all the land to the east of Berkswell Windmill within the line of proposed new Balsall Bypass road. It is stated that it is not intended to release this land for housing. If that is so, why is it necessary to remove it from the Green Belt? It would be far better to retain both areas east and west of Windmill Lane within the Green Belt and take action to enhance their green belt status, rather than dismiss them offhand as low quality green belt.
Q10	Kate Riemer [5550]		The Plan seeks to "identify land where development would be inappropriate because of its impact on, for instance, environmental or historic assets". It fails in this aim with proposed development on the eastern edge of Balsall Common. Once this historic landscape is removed from the Green Belt it can never be reclaimed. The importance of protecting the Meriden Gap cannot be too highly emphasized. To extend the Green Belt boundary at its narrowest point to the east of the village and build on Barratt's Farm will defeat its primary intention of restraining urban sprawl between Coventry, Birmingham and Solihull.
Q10	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	A key change to the Green Belt is being predicated on the proposed HS2 route. Whilst there is no doubt this will provide a boundary line, it is not currently built or in construction, so we query the soundness of relying on the strong and defensible boundary being relied upon to form an eastern boundary to Balsall Common. This presents an issue of certainty and timing
Q10	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	There is no planning logic for the suggested change to the green belt boundary east of Balsall Common. Inappropriate to remove green belt designation between Windmill Lane and the proposed bypass. Area is highly performing green belt, particularly for preventing towns merging.
Q10	Lisa Champion [5325]		Development in other parts of Balsall should provide the allocation rather than encroaching on good quality green belt and the impact on the windmill. This area has already experienced development.
Q10	Matthew Quinn [4344]		Historic Windmill. Solihull must have more suitable Brownfield sites than building on greenbelt land. The closing of The Meriden Gap is worrying. Once green belt is gone it is lost forever
Q10	Matthew Quinn [4344]		The closing of The Meriden Gap is worrying. Once green belt is gone it is lost forever.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary on the eastern side of Balsall Common will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common and its elevation in settlement hierarchy within the Borough with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation. Also, part of the proposed allocation sites and those areas not allocated for development lie within the highest performing area within the Green Belt Assessment
Q10	Mr & Mrs Dallow [5801]		There is a national crisis regarding loss of wildlife, birds, bees and all insects and we are planning to build 1,000s of houses of precious green belt land. Time we put a stop to these plans its becoming a joke! It would appear SMBC will be very happy when our boundaries join up with Coventry with no fields in-between.
Q10	Mr & Mrs Hughes [5467]		Site 22 is a brownfield site, why not only take the previously developed land out of the green belt? Only 30% of the area is brownfield.
Q10	Mr Andrew Burrow [3727]		Almost all of this land scored 12 in the Atkins greenbelt study. Consequently, it makes the highest contribution possible to the purposes of the greenbelt, It is also a key part of the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap. As such its removal is totally contrary to policy both NPPF and Solihull's. Its proposed removal looks so contrary to the evidence that it makes the SMBC approach look predetermined around having a bypass that itself has not been justified in the draft plan. Most this area of land forms part of the setting of the historic and listed Berkswell windmill.
Q10	Mr Andrew Fox [5816]		What is the point of Greenbelt if it can be just withdrawn...?
Q10	Mr Andrew Hall [5302]		Plus, this is more Green belt that is being lost to new estates.
Q10	Mr C Gledhill [4812]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q10	Mr Christopher McDermott [3693]		i don't think the green belt boundary should be moved from the existing east side of the village
Q10	Mr D Edmonds [4808]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mr D Perks [3399]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Mr David Varley [3385]		I currently walk from Waste Lane through Pheasant Oak Farm, down Hob Lane and across fields to Evesons Garage on the A452 then back down Windmill Lane about twice a week. This area would be substantially changed with potential build in the future. Any developments would have to take account of the Windmill at the top of the land fronting Windmill Lane and must be appropriate for the area.
Q10	Mr G Frost [4809]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mr Gary Lindop [5433]		Moving the greenbelt boundary further east to the line of the proposed bypass serves no purpose other than to help earmark yet another site for future housing development in this area. The revised boundary would take Windmill Lane and part of Hob Lane out of the greenbelt and permanently destroy the rural character of these roads and the surrounding area. The greenbelt boundary should remain unchanged and the bypass should not be built.
Q10	Mr Geoffrey Kennedy [3435]		The area to the east of Balsall Common is under significant threat of development, including from Coventry. The land should remain green belt.
Q10	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		Green Belt Enhancements. It is an insult to the intelligence of residents to suggest that destruction of an area of Green Belt equal to the current area of the entire village, in the narrowest part of the Meriden gap, "provides an opportunity".
Q10	Mr Graham Thomas [5361]		There is NO JUSTIFICATION for the extension of the Green Belt boundary to the East and South of Balsall Common beyond the existing clear, identifiable and defensible line created by existing development on Windmill Lane and Waste Lane. It is ideal to fulfil the NPPF guideline to 'prevent urban sprawl' (Paragraph 359). There is no need at all to reduce the Green Belt further in the Plan to 2028.
Q10	Mr H Keene [4806]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		The existing green belt should be recognised and respected. There are no exceptional circumstances that require green belt to be developed.
Q10	Mr Henning Kleine [3633]		The government has continuously stated that green belts are to be preserved, which seems to be completely ignored by the Solihull.
Q10	Mr J Stanley [4786]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mr Julian Henwood [5411]		This is just the destruction of green belt by another name with no specific rationale having been identified justifying such destruction.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Mr Keith Tindall [3020]		The proposal cannot be justified and will lead to uncontrolled development sprawl. It is contrary to the Atkins Green Belt Report 2016 which scored it 12. It will weaken the Council's position in defending the Meriden Gap, and to paraphrase Professor Alan Wenban-Smith 'allocation of housing is a one way process'; in other words its removal will encourage even more unsustainable development.
Q10	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		The local greenbelt offers significant amenity to Balsall Common and the impact of all proposed projects should be assessed in the aggregate. To meet housing need, green belt may need to be released but this should be sensitive to the needs of the community and should be restricted to tightly border proposed housing allocations. The plan makes no justification for the release of additional green belt land when this is not required for any planned housing development. It has a planning horizon past 2030 and any further releases should be considered after that date as part of subsequent planning exercises.
Q10	Mr Leigh Mayers [3124]		Object to changing the green belt boundaries just because the government wants more houses. There are plenty of brownfield sites in the surrounding area.
Q10	Mr Leslie Noble [3503]		The Green belt should be defended on all boundaries where possible
Q10	Mr P Greasley [4813]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mr Paul Joyner [3573]		Balsall Common is under siege, from Solihull council housing plans, HS2, Road planners and the increased activity from the airport. Any removal of the Green belt, allowing for future unplanned and unregulated development must not happen. I have concerns over the removal of green belt outside of the allocated development areas. this will open up the risk to a blanket coverage of the village of unplanned and uncoordinated developments.
Q10	Mr R A Smith [4782]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mr Richard Burgess [5518]		Why does Balsall Common have to take such a large percentage of the boroughs housing needs? The overall proposed development is disproportionate to the nature of the village and will turn it into a small town. The continued raid upon the green belt sets a dangerous precedent for future over development. Please apply common sense and prevent over development of what is a supposed to be a village!
Q10	Mr Richard Chadwick [5964]		The Barratts Lane plan will mean our property (Dragonflies) on Waste Lane becomes surrounded by houses and the new bypass, I therefore ask you INCLUDE our property in the development proposal. This will mean more houses and easier access to Waste Lane.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Mr Richard Davis [5665]		Additional development will outstrip village facilities
Q10	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		Only land needed now should be released. In particular land between Waste Lane and Kenilworth Road should not be released.
Q10	Mr T N Walton [4817]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mr Tony Mann [5612]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q10	Mr William Cairns [3206]		Assuming that the plan goes ahead then the additional sites listed will be considered but we are concerned that sites sandwiched between the existing rail lines, HS2 and A452 are not conducive to quality accommodation for residents due to noise, and pollution. The site in Old Waste Lane would represent over intensification in an established rural location. The take of green belt land south of Hob Lane and east of Windmill Lane using the proposed bypass line is totally unnecessary as there is no planned development listed in this area and is NOT part of this Local Plan review.
Q10	Mrs E A Seal [4814]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs J Bliss [4803]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs Anya Schofield [5921]		The plans are not clear as to what happens to the Greenway - a key green space and heritage site - which should be protected
Q10	Mrs B Stanley [4785]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs Barbara Hedley [5519]		seems logical to do so
Q10	Mrs C Cavigan [4810]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements
Q10	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		Land not marked for development should not be taken out of the Greenbelt especially the land between Waste Lane and Kenilworth Rd.
Q10	Mrs Catherine Brown [5731]		I object to the loss of green belt Land. Balsall Common is a village and green space around it should be maintained. The Meriden gap should not be eroded in order to pack houses into a village without the amenities to support more people. I'm really disappointed with the proposals made by Solihull council and the lack of foresight to see the impact on the current residents of Balsall Common, who already have noise and pollutions problems from HS2 and the airport. Please do not build a bypass and Reduce the housing to be built in the village.
Q10	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Green Belt land must be protected - especially the Meriden Gap.
Q10	Mrs Eleanor Lee [6172]		We believe the boundary line for the village should remain as Balsall Street East

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]		I support a boundary for village development and protection of the green belt. I would like to see this policy strengthened to emphasise a commitment to always using brownfield sites or previously developed green belt sites when these are available in the area. The policies of a Conservative council should reflect the commitments of the West Midlands Mayor and the Government to protect the green belt
Q10	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		No justification for such a change. Loss of protection for smaller parcels of land could result in unstructured, random development as individual sites are promoted for development. Land between Old Waste Lane and Waste Lane does have good accessibility and would cause less harm than other areas. Loss of Green Belt in Barratt's Farm area, well used by walkers, cannot be compensated for within these plans. It is nonsense to suggest that destruction of an area of Green Belt equal to the current area of the entire village, in the narrowest part of the Meriden gap provides an opportunity.
Q10	Mrs H Brookes [4795]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q10	Mrs H Brookes [4795]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs Helen Dean [2920]		Balsall Street East must remain the defensible boundary. Any development which extends beyond this road into the Green Belt must be opposed by SMBC.
Q10	Mrs Helen Goodwin [4636]		The whole idea of moving the boundary makes a mockery of the what the village is about and has tried to maintain for all of these years. Once these boundaries are lost, they run the risk of being eroded continually over the next generations to come.
Q10	Mrs J A Gledhill [4811]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs J Carpenter [4796]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs J E Smith [4781]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Mrs Jennifer K Darby [6284]		Three brownfield sites in Balsall Common were suggested as alternatives to site 2 and 3 in the last consultation. However instead of developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. Other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers (South Shirley and Dickins Heath) and Dorridge has not been allocated any housing sites at all. This does not seem to be a fair distribution. Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements despite support for protecting the Meriden Gap.
Q10	Mrs Judith Thomas [3628]		<p>The local greenbelt offers significant amenity to Balsall Common and the impact of all proposed projects should be assessed in the aggregate. To meet housing need, green belt may need to be released but this should be sensitive to the needs of the community and should be restricted to tightly border proposed housing allocations.</p> <p>The plan makes no justification for the release of additional green belt land when this is not required for any planned housing development. It has a planning horizon past 2030 and any further releases should be considered after that date as part of subsequent planning exercise.</p>
Q10	Mrs K Drakes [4793]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs K Wilkinson [6269]		<p>Object to the extensive erosion of green belt, extending from Pheasant Oak Farm to Evesons Fuels. I assume that this means that you are considering further housing which in total will make Balsall Common into a town. The original intention of this part of the green belt was to provide an open space between Balsall Common and Coventry and this is rapidly becoming eroded.</p> <p>Need to consider the effects of built development on the atmosphere in what currently is a green lung between Balsall Common and Coventry.</p>
Q10	Mrs L Keene [4800]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs Leslie Eustace [4792]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Mrs M Edmonds [4804]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs ML Marsden [5593]		SMBC proposes to amend the Green Belt boundary of Balsall Common. On paper the boundary seems to make sense but this relies on the bypass being built.
Q10	Mrs P Green [4790]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Mrs Rita Perks [4805]		Three brownfield sites in Balsall Common were suggested as alternatives to site 2 and 3 in the last consultation. However instead of developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. Other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers (South Shirley and Dickins Heath) and Dorridge has not been allocated any housing sites at all. This does not seem to be a fair distribution. Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements despite support for protecting the Meriden Gap.
Q10	Mrs Sharon Lindop [6163]		Removing the 'washed over' Green Belt status of this area by moving the existing greenbelt boundary further east to the line of the 'proposed' bypass serves no purpose other than to earmark yet another site for potential housing development in the future. The revised boundary would take Windmill Lane and part of Hob Lane out of the greenbelt and permanently destroy the rural character of these roads and the surrounding area. This would cause a further reduction in the 'Meriden Gap' and be a 'thumbs up' to developers for ongoing 'urban sprawl'.
Q10	Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]		Three brownfield sites in Balsall Common were suggested as alternatives to site 2 and 3 in the last consultation. However instead of developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. Other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers (South Shirley and Dickins Heath) and Dorridge has not been allocated any housing sites at all. This does not seem to be a fair distribution. Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements despite support for protecting the Meriden Gap.
Q10	Ms Anne Stewart [5464]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q10	Ms Jennifer Cayley [5598]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q10	Ms Joanne Bellamy [5599]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Ms Kat Mann [5614]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Ms Wendy Gault [6134]		I do not understand the logic or rationale for this at all and it is not based on any evidence/policy direction within the NPPF.
Q10	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We agree that the Green Belt boundary should be amended to reflect HS2 and other growth, however we disagree with the proposed amendment around Park Lane. We have identified a suggested Green Belt boundary shown in the Context Plan, which we consider presents a more logical boundary based on the committed infrastructure development around Park Lane, and the proposed allocation at Lavender Hall Farm to the east. HS2 will ultimately provide a new defensible boundary to Balsall Common and our Client's site (Land south of Park Lane) falls within this boundary, therefore ensuring there will be no encroachment into the open countryside.
Q10	Richard Lloyd [2616]		The proposed changes are unacceptable and unjustified, and ignore the high value placed on the Green Belt in that area. All areas, beyond those taken for housing during the currency of the Local Plan, should retain Green Belt protection due to the narrowness of the Meriden Gap.
Q10	Richard Onions [4280]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Roger Howles [6238]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q10	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary on the eastern side of Balsall Common will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common and its elevation in settlement hierarchy within the Borough with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation. Also, part of the proposed allocation sites and those areas not allocated for development lie within the highest performing area within the Green Belt Assessment.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q10	Sheila Cooper [2560]		<p>No exceptional circumstances justifying such an action.</p> <p>Removal of Green Belt status for land south of Old Waste Lane/Waste Lane will remove ALL protection from development. Will result in unstructured, random development as individual sites are promoted for development through the normal planning system.</p> <p>This is strategically important and highly performing Green Belt and its loss will cause a strategic diminution of the Green Belt and Meriden Gap. Green Belt status of significance to setting of Windmill and rural character.</p> <p>If Pheasant Oak Farm is developed boundary should be set tightly round the Brownfield part of the development.</p>
Q10	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	<p>Spitfire Homes welcomes the changes to the Green Belt Boundary. It is recognised that this is necessary and welcomed in order to meet the Councils housing target. The level of growth proposed for Balsall Common should be seen as a minimum figure. Welcome acknowledgement that site 101 would fall within settlement boundary</p>
Q10	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>The proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary on the eastern side of Balsall Common will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common and its elevation in settlement hierarchy within the Borough with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation.</p> <p>Also, part of the proposed allocation sites and those areas not allocated for development lie within the highest performing area within the Green Belt Assessment.</p>
Q10	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>The proposed amendment to the Green Belt boundary on the eastern side of Balsall Common will have significant implications for development over and above the allocations proposed. Lifting Green Belt restrictions on land will put considerable pressures for development and the future growth of Balsall Common and its elevation in settlement hierarchy within the Borough with insufficient consideration on how this will be dealt with within this supplementary consultation.</p> <p>Also, part of the proposed allocation sites and those areas not allocated for development lie within the highest performing area within the Green Belt Assessment.</p>
Q10	Wendy Cairns [4226]		<p>Any attempt to place developments in small hamlets and settlements should be resisted, these would be in the Meriden Gap the next thing we would see would be further uncontrolled enlargement out of character with these locations. Erosion of green belt and weakening of the Meriden Gaps main purpose to stop urban sprawl.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Blythe			
Q11	A & V Blake [4304]		Concern about Site 11 and Objection to Site 12: - The traffic along Dog Kennel Rd & Blackford Rd has substantially increased recently. What will it be like if 572 homes are built on Site 11 & 1000 on Site 12? More air pollution?
Q11	Agnes Thomas [5386]		Objection to Site 4. - Extra people/traffic will exacerbate congestion through Tidbury Green, especially at peak times - Sports fields are liable to flooding and would exacerbate the flooding problems to neighbouring properties. Soil type does not drain well and would need to be built on deep piles - Negative impact on Tithe Barn Wood, a significant Ancient Woodland - Overwhelming demand on already crowded local rail services and inadequate parking at Whitlock's End station
Q11	Akamba Heritage Centre (Mr Chris Canaan) [5539]		Demand for places at oversubscribed Dickens Heath School The sports fields are liable to flooding most years and would exacerbate the flooding problem to neighbouring properties. The Site consists of deep boulder clay which does not drain well and dwellings would need to be built on deep piles. Extra people/traffic will exacerbate congestion through the Dickens Heath Village, on the A34 and surrounding roads especially at peak times. Demands on already crowded local rail services and inadequate parking at the station and Village centre.
Q11	Alison Robbins [4062]		- 38% of the Solihull Borough current plan is in Blythe Valley. - 2050 New houses = 4,000 more cars - Congestion in Shirley - Limited parking in public areas, shopping areas and at stations - Places at Schools will be stretched - G.P. capacity -
Q11	Andrew Harfoot [6281]		Where are the additional roads, byways, hospitals, dentists, emergency services, etc. going to come from to deal with the increase in demand? Perhaps the new breed of individual does not require this level of service & security and hospitals etc are a thing of the past? How will the increase in noise and light pollution be managed to ensure no disruption to local wildlife and living?
Q11	Ann Marie Reohorn [5566]		high car ownership, existing road congestion. road network inadequate

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Barry Jackson [3957]		I support all of the infrastructure requirements and feel that they must be implemented if even a small number of houses are built. Traffic in Dickens Heath and Shirley is already at an unacceptable level. The roads simply can't cope with any more traffic. Other infrastructure cannot cope, such as Schools and so on.
Q11	Bromsgrove District Council (M Dunphy) [3927]		Reiterate concerns about potential cumulative impacts of growth on Bromsgrove DC and Wythall and Hollywood in particular. Plan recognises poor public transport links between settlements, and public transport/highway capacity improvements must be provided. Concern relating to potential impact on other infrastructure, eg schools/medical services within settlements in Bromsgrove. Little that addresses concerns and great deal of evidence based work still required regarding infrastructure. Should be addressed through Statement of Common Ground.
Q11	Charlotte Weston [6176]		A key infrastructure requirement not included is additional train capacity (specifically increased number of seats at peak times). Current trains running on the Whitlocks End to Snowhill line are already overcrowded and do not have sufficient capacity, with standing room only as they near Birmingham. This has got worse the last three years, and hundreds more homes around Dickens Heath would cause significant issues without additional carriages to increase capacity. Additional parking in Dickens Heath must be included, as it is already an issue let alone with further developments.
Q11	Cheswick Green Parish Council (Mrs M Zizzi) [2095]		- History of flood events in Cheswick Green, that will be only exacerbate in future. Consultation documents do not refer to Flood Report 2019. Concern that increased development will exacerbate existing problems. - Severe congestion on Creynolds Lane, Ta
Q11	Chris Moore [6291]		Traffic congestion already horrendous on Stratford Road and junctions such as Creynolds Lane/Dog Kennel Lane with significant delays. Cheswick Green does not have infrastructure to cope with more houses/traffic. No need for MSA as there are service station and food facilities off Junction 4 already.
Q11	Chris Isaacs [4450]		Objection to development in Shirley/Blythe: 1) There would be less green space and the increase in people would put even more pressure on local infrastructures, particularly roads. How are the council going to address the massive gridlocks that will result; we have heard nothing about this. 2) the effect on wildlife would be totally unacceptable, the air quality would deteriorate even further. Similarly the felling of so many trees is morally indefensible.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Christine Street [4315]		<p>- The document states that sports provision is to be improved. How can this be improved by building on all of the sports fields at Old Yardleians, Highgate, Wychall Wanderers, Solihull Town and Leafield?</p> <p>- Loss of fields mean children will have nowhere</p>
Q11	Cllr Adam Kent [5204]		<p>Objection to Sites 4&26:</p> <p>- Roads are narrow country lanes around Dickens Heath and Major Green and not suitable for proposed traffic volumes, already suffering from overuse as ratrun to A34 and Birmingham City centre</p> <p>- Pressure on schools undetermined</p> <p>- Replacement school pitches undetermined</p> <p>- Whitlocks End station car park full at 7.40am, parking on neighbouring roads. Attracts residents as far away as Redditch.</p> <p>- More frequent train services should be extended to Henley-in-Arden at least</p> <p>- Tilehouse Lane and Haslucks Green Road are accident blackspots</p> <p>- Bills Lane exit from Site 26 will cause similar issues</p>
Q11	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>CIL payments/boundary issues between settlements.</p> <p>Significant peak loading put on Dog Kennel Lane/Tanworth Lane/Blackford Road/Haslucks Green Road/Bills Lane/Shakespeare Drive/Hurdis Road/Burman Road/School Road and A34, with consequential air quality issues, especially near schools.</p> <p>Rewording required of paragraph on integration, as problematic as many will not agree, and concern about merging settlements with distinctive identities. What does adequate separating function mean in practice?</p> <p>Challenges over incorporating public transport, doctors, and secondary schools.</p> <p>Proper delivery of cycling provisions.</p> <p>Structural issues on Blackford Road.</p> <p>Access to new school from Site 26.</p> <p>Support replacement of Sportsfields, play space and green belt enhancements.</p>
Q11	Councillor T Hodgson [2532]		<p>Alarmed by the lack of infrastructure proposed to accommodate this colossal increase in housing at Sites 4, 11, 12 and 26, with only one new primary school planned in Shirley, inadequate enhancements to the highway network, including public transport, and no indication of additional healthcare facilities to meet the demands of the vastly increased population. This is an unsustainable position for Shirley</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>Disagree that new development at Dickens Heath will "add to the vibrancy and vitality of the settlement, whilst retaining the intrinsic character of distinctive villages separated by open countryside."</p> <p>Do not agree with statement regarding public transport use. There is high car ownership in the area and there will be low uptake of public transport</p> <p>Car Park at Whitlocks End station is full at 8am and expansion would not assist much. There are no employment opportunities and none proposed which will increase commuting.</p> <p>Walking and cycling will be reduced as cannot access Birchy Close.</p> <p>Highways improvements will not be feasible on 20mph roads.</p> <p>More off-street parking in Dickens Heath will be difficult to achieve.</p> <p>Lack of firm proposals to replace sports pitches.</p> <p><u>Agree with provision of country park.</u></p>
Q11	David Harvey [5262]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Route to and from Tilehouse Lane via Tythe Barn Lane is already very congested at rush hour. - At these times it is extremely difficult to get out of the village notably from Three Acres Lane, very difficult to navigate at school drop off times. - Parked cars on Tythe Barn Lane create obstructions close to the traffic calming and a gridlock often occurs. Narrow roads and traffic calming will not be able to cope. - Need more information on proposed highway improvements.
Q11	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		<p>Qualified support to infrastructure proposals as concerns over loss of locally accessible sports grounds with important links to village.</p> <p>Agree higher population provides potential for improved public transport</p> <p>Support improved Pedestrian & Cycling proposals</p> <p>Highway improvements are critical to address village congestion and new housing sites</p> <p>Welcome additional off-street parking improvements</p> <p>Agree primary school provision is currently adequate</p> <p>Note health provision is still in early stage discussions</p> <p>Replacement of sports facilities within area and to improved standard should be a priority</p> <p>Support adequate play and open space areas with good access in new developments.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Dickens Heath Residents Association (Trevor Eames) [6245]		Document states that the indicated highway improvements are only likely to be needed and off-street parking improvements at Dickens Heath only may be needed; local residents not assured that necessary infrastructure would be provided. Concerns have not been addressed over existing traffic congestion issues and inadequate rural highway network. Not possible to envisage how any highway scheme could satisfactorily address both proposed housing and ameliorate existing congestion. No replacement sports pitches indicated in plan; key priority for residents association that existing sports grounds are retained within site 4; strongly opposed to alternative more remote location elsewhere in green belt countryside.
Q11	Dr Neeta Manek [5239]		Objection to Site 4: - Currently major traffic congestion on Tythe Barn lane in and out of Dickens Heath village. - Infrastructure in the village has been overwhelmed - More housing will just make it worse. - Need to replace sports field like for like as this is a key facility for the community.
Q11	Dr Sophie McDowall [5311]		Objection to Site 4: - Increase in traffic will create excessive congestion and put more pressure upon parking at the station and in surrounding roads. - Need to protect ancient woodland of Tithe Barn Wood - Loss of wildlife habitat - Flooding will worsen due to clay on site
Q11	Edward Fraser [4138]		- Must include full infrastructure development. - Object as Site 26 along with Site 12 would form a pincer attack on the old Site 13 rendering it vulnerable to future development. - Increase of traffic on Bills Lane would be intolerable both during cons
Q11	Gemma Welch [4413]		Objection to proposed development in Shirley: - Too much focus has been placed on areas surrounding Shirley, which is unable to withstand the proposed growth. - Too much traffic already in Shirley - Proposal of one primary school is insufficient, new population will create need for new secondary school. School places already in high demand. - Public transport in area is insufficient - GPs are oversubscribed - Parking issues at Whitlocks End station and Shirley station.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle on infrastructure however, the current lack of traffic assessments make it difficult to adequately assess what highway improvements are necessary and impact on the choice of sites and site alternatives.
Q11	Gina Ready [3393]		Loss of what little open space is available to South Shirley. More cars on Tanworth Lane and the surrounding roads at peak times to add to traffic from Dickens Heath area, with consequent pollution and adverse impacts on health. More pressure on local schools, primary and secondary, and GP practices. More pressure on roads and infrastructure, parking at stations and continued congestion all around the main A34.
Q11	Graham Watson [3355]		In terms of traffic volumes Majors Green is served by a rural infrastructure of relatively narrow country lanes. Such is the level of traffic congestion at certain times of the day I am unable to exit or gain access to my own drive! Planners need to understand the continued urban sprawl on the borders of Bromsgrove DC is unacceptable and irresponsible. This will only exacerbate an existing significant problem of too many cars and HGV's trying to negotiate roads that lack the capacity to cope.
Q11	Graham Thomas [5387]		Objection to Site 4: - Loss of playing pitches, which is contrary to government policy. - Sports fields are liable to flooding and would exacerbate flooding to neighbouring properties.
Q11	Gregory Allport [2638]		Too much growth in Blythe creating unsustainable environment. Tanworth Lane & Dog Kennel Lane already experience heavy congestion at peak periods, with rural roads subject to traffic congestion. Inadequate provision for infrastructure has led to accidents, flooding, questionable planning decisions.
Q11	H Reed [4641]		Objection to Sites 4 and 26: - Existing flooding and drainage issues: In May 2019 Haslucks Gn Rd, Dickens Heath Rd, Tythe Barn Lane, Truemans Heath Lane and Peterbrook Rd all flooded - No detail on replacement sports pitches - Site is >1.7km from Dickens Heath centre, exceeding Government's sustainability measure - Improved pavements, roads, trains, cycle lanes and bus routes required. - Existing congestion issue - traffic backs up to Bills Lane from Stratford Road. - Haslucks Green Road as congested as Dickens Heath Road.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Iain McDowall [5320]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in traffic will create excessive congestion and put more pressure upon parking at the station and in surrounding roads. - Need to protect ancient woodland of Tithe Barn Wood - Loss of wildlife habitat - Flooding will worsen due to clay on site
Q11	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	<p>IM Properties secured planning permission at Blythe Valley Park for residential, employment and mixed uses in 2017.</p> <p>IM agrees with the infrastructure requirements as set out within the consultation document and is currently working with SMBC and other stakeholders to deliver improvements to infrastructure within Blythe and the wider Borough.</p> <p>Keen to further understand what specific improvements the Council intend to make to local schools and medical facilities in order to facilitate development within the ward.</p>
Q11	Jean Hobbs [2983]		<p>Housing is essential we know but the influx of more cars and with building, more lorries to our narrow country lanes, just adds to the congestion that is here already.</p> <p>Whitlocks End station car park is already full, and the narrow roads and very narrow footpaths, make it difficult to walk safely in the area. Surely before any more planning is given, infrastructure should be at the top of the agenda, or will it take more accidents before this is taken into consideration.</p>
Q11	Jen Hickman [3522]		<p>'Highway Improvements' will impact green belt - ancient hedgerows and established trees. The congestion is caused by traffic crossing Shirley from Dicken's Heath and beyond to get to the business parks and Solihull. Houses should be built nearer to jobs.</p> <p>The 'Green Belt' should include allocations 12,13 and 26 to provide for the health and well being of the local community. The hedgerows, trees, fields and wetland areas are important wildlife habitats which currently link to other green areas to provide wildlife corridors. I support allocation 13 becoming a Nature Reserve.</p>
Q11	Jennifer Archer [4016]		<p>Blythe area already has pressure on its infrastructure. The roads are heavily congested and these matters need addressing prior to adding a possible 4,000 extra vehicles as it is unable to cope with the existing traffic.</p> <p>There is a limit as to what can be done to improve the roads in the area due to ancient hedgerows having preservation orders on them. The appropriate traffic surveys have not been undertaken. We are in great danger of having additional housing and the area and services breaking under the pressure.</p> <p>Please consider the transport and the local facilities before allowing further development.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Jo Hodgson [6219]		<p>Concern for number of properties built in Blythe. This will result in huge traffic problems which in turn will increase air pollution. There is also no plan to my knowledge for infrastructure, such as schools, GP surgeries, public transport.</p> <p>38% of the whole borough's housing allocation is in the Blythe/Shirley South Wards. Why have other areas in the borough not been put forward for housing development?</p> <p>Will result in total gridlock. The roads around these areas are already very congested at peak times</p>
Q11	Joanne Liddiard- McGann [3407]		<p>Traffic in Shirley is already appalling. You cannot get anywhere near Staetford Rd in car until after 9am. Tamworth Lane, Dog Kennel Lane are at a standstill. No amount of improved infrastructure will compensate for the extra houses you suggest.</p>
Q11	Joelle Hill [4425]		<p>Reduce allocation in Blythe area.</p> <p>Provision for minimal intrusion on 7.5t restricted routes.</p> <p>Review traffic calming and preferred routes around the area to more sustainable robust roads with better infrastructure.</p> <p>Make Monkspath Hall a more important route into Solihull.</p> <p>Pay more attention to flood and air quality problems in the area.</p> <p>Council's policy of allowing multiple car showrooms is at odds with the infrastructure needs of increased public transport availability.</p>
Q11	John Dancer [4303]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Balsall Common is getting a bypass, but nothing is proposed for the already busy A34 area. - Para. 126 incorrect; there are 3 services/hour to Birmingham, not Stratford. - Plan does not recognise that Dickens Heath is already a 'rat run' for traffic,
Q11	John Dimock [5669]		<p>Flooding has recently been severe problem in this clay area & this development will clearly make it worse in wet weather.</p> <p>This will increase demands on already over crowded parking facilities in town centre & rail station</p> <p>Loss of sports grounds & recreation areas for 9 clubs which is contrary to Government policy</p> <p>Demand for places at already oversubscribed Dickens Heath School</p>
Q11	John Robbins [4272]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 38% of the Solihull Borough current plan is in Blythe Valley. - 2050 New houses = 4,000 more cars - Congestion in Shirley - Limited parking at stations - Places at Schools - G.P. capacity - will add additional pressure - Removal of sports g

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Kate Edwards [3285]		<p>Parking at station and trains always FULL. Roads congested and additional housing will make worse. Require cycle lanes and improved public transport.</p> <p>Local schools are all full, where will new families school their children?</p> <p>Loss of local sports grounds, green land so children cannot play football etc locally...where will they go? ...on the streets, fed up..increased crime? Open fields should be used for Nature Reserve.</p> <p>GPs already stretched meeting the demands of the current population, will be exacerbated by increase.</p> <p>Area prone to flooding. Significant flooding of new builds in Dickens Heath. Will increase risk.</p>
Q11	Landowner Winterton Farm [5795]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	<p>Paragraphs 152 to 145 list a range of potential infrastructure requirements for the Blythe area which includes;</p> <p>improved public transport, pedestrian and cycle connectivity, highway improvements, parking improvements, health provision, sports and recreation and open space.</p> <p>We support the proposed infrastructure requirements and consider that, if allocated, our client's land would be able to support the provision of the infrastructure requirements</p>
Q11	M Lopez [6014]		<p>The inclusion of a primary school is welcomed, but there is no mention of the subsequent secondary school that the new primary school will feed into. This <u>should be considered, in terms of school places.</u></p>
Q11	Mark Taft [3595]		<p>38% of Solihull housing in Blythe Valley</p> <p>No road capacity for another 4000 cars for 2000 new homes</p> <p>Loss of green belt for community use</p> <p>No recognition of existing air pollution levels</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure expansion options</p> <p>Limited Parking at stations</p> <p>Removal of Playing fields</p> <p>Congestion and grid locked roads already a problem</p> <p>Lack of schools and GP surgery's</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>We agree with the expert view of Jean Walters, see attached document.</p> <p>What is needed :-</p> <p>Parking at Earlswood station. Cycle paths through Area13</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle on infrastructure however, the current lack of traffic assessments make it difficult to adequately assess what highway improvements are necessary and impact on the choice of sites and site alternatives.
Q11	Miss Leigh Cole [5220]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure around Dickens Heath is already awful - The road system is gridlocked every day in peak hours. - The idea that residents in new housing will walk to the school or shops on the other side of the village is not realistic. - The secondary
Q11	Miss Clare Saint [5846]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better provision for transport infrastructure is needed. - Not enough car parking at train stations at the moment. (No spaces after 8am). Whitlocks End train station is full by 8.30. - Bus routes are insufficient and not regular or reliable enough.
Q11	Miss Janna Hobbs [5197]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to Sites 4 and 26: - Bills Lane and Dickens Heath Road are already congested - Roads not designed to support increased traffic - No real plan for movement of traffic arising from new developments - Loss of sports grounds - existing users will need to travel further to replacements - Existing parking issues - Existing infrastructure cannot cope
Q11	Miss Laura Lewis [6171]		2050 new homes would mean 4000 more cars. The proposed road improvements are restricted by ancient hedgerows. Increased population would have a negative effect on schools, gp surgeries, parking at stations, pollution, car accidents and crime rates. There'd be a loss of access to green belt. Due to the increase in population we need off road cycle paths to protect cyclists. We need improved public transport to cope with the extra demand that will be placed on these services. We need a park and ride, and for allocation 13 to be changed from public open space status to nature reserve.
Q11	Miss Susan Hillitt [5660]		<p>All of the traffic from new homes will use Bills Lane, Haslucks Green Road and Blackford Road.</p> <p>These roads already carry high volume traffic.</p>
Q11	Mr & Mrs Abbotts [4492]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to Site 4: - Roads in and around Majors Green and Whitlocks End are extremely busy and were and still are only country lanes. - Since Dickens Heath was built the increase in the traffic using these narrow roads is already making it dangerous to cross any of the roads and trying to cross to Whitlocks End Station is extremely dangerous. - Building even more houses in this area is going to make traffic on these roads impossible

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mr Adam Hunter [3332]		Will exacerbate already congested roads, particularly at peak times around Dickens Heath. This has a direct impact on pollution from cars, which is injurious to health. Large development is already taking place in Tidbury Green (Tidbury Heights and Lowbrook Lane) which is already adding to problems. Rail service from Whitlocks End is well used and car parking is already inadequate. Extra housing will exacerbate the problem. Station is more than 800m from significant parts of Dickens Heath, so people will use cars. Dickens Heath School is already oversubscribed.
Q11	Mr Alex Lukeman [3387]		Whilst planners prefer density to enable services and amenities to be provided the concentration of new development in Blythe will be unsustainable. It accounts for over 38% of planned growth which is an unfair and disproportionate burden. The existing infrastructure is already under strain (roads, GP practices, schools). It is difficult to see how sufficient road improvement can be made to alleviate the existing and future requirements as they will need to feed into the A34 or congested roads into Solihull. Ancient hedgerows, trees and sites restrict improvements in the immediate area. "Urbs in rure" is being forgotten.
Q11	Mr Arthur Baker [6158]		(1) I object to loosing 200 trees that provide wildlife habitats also water drainage for the site. (2) Loosing the wild life corridor running the length at the back of Blackford road. (3) I question the need to increase the number of homes from 400 to 572 adding to the already substantially increased volume of traffic along Blackford Road & Stratford Road. (4) Not all older residents want to live in McCarthy & Stone Retirement Flats there fore we need homes for older residents which will release larger family homes.
Q11	Mr Bernard James McGillion [5963]		High density living requires an infrastructure which can deliver schools, doctors, hospitals and traffic flow. There is no regard to the infrastructure in this plan. Solihull schools are full, doctors surgeries are struggling and Solihull hospital can't cope. Residents will be travelling across to Heartlands and the Queen Elizabeth, adding to the traffic congestion on the roads around Solihull.
Q11	Mr Chris Burrows [5298]		Objection to Site 12: - Added flood risk along Mount Brook water course. - Road capacity adjacent to site is already close to acceptable limits (including A34, Creynolds Lane, Dog Kennel Lane, Tamworth Lane, B4102, Lady Lane).

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mr Craig Armstrong [3190]		Road infrastructure within and surrounding Dickens Heath is unable to cope with current traffic levels and any additional development will exacerbate the situation. Village has now reached the absolute limit of its expansion. Any further expansion will place a real and significant strain on roads such as Tythe Barn Lane. Village is slowly being choked by the volume of traffic on the roads and cannot sustain any further development without a significant strain on the existing infrastructure, amenities and the residents who have chosen to live here. Insufficient parking in village centre will be exacerbated by additional development.
Q11	Mr D Tabb [4499]		Objection to Sites 4 and 26: - The roads are already overloaded many times during the day. - To think that the planned homes will all use the train services is obviously nonsense. - Dickens Heath is gridlocked many times during the day and Haslucks Green Road has become unbelievably busy with the add ons to Dickens Heath and Tidbury Heights. - We do not have the school places or medical services to cope with this either.
Q11	Mr Darryl Chinn [5708]		Neither Bills Lane nor Haslucks Green are wide roads in this area. A further increase in 600 plus cars using these roads will only increase congestion, accidents which are regular at the bend at the Bills Lane junction and also the bridge over the Stratford canal. There will also be increases in noise and air pollution and an increase in danger to pedestrians. The infrastructure is neither here now nor planned to be to cope.
Q11	Mr David Neal [5868]		It is presumed that the vast majority of new households will travel out of the area. The options will be along gridlocked roads to the M42 or along impractical minor roads to reach and park up at Whitlock's End rail station. The present state of the roads together with the increased usage will give rise to dangerous conditions. I speak with experience as a seasoned cyclist who has seen conditions deteriorate recently. Despite your best intentions people will not walk or cycle on these roads but merely clog them up in order to vacate the area.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mr Edward Tan [5258]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Would create substantial vehicular traffic. - Proposals for sports facility would not adequately replace the many sports clubs' requirements. - Traffic congestion is a major issue. - Lived on Tythe Barn Lane 20 years, I witnessed a huge spike in cut-through traffic. - The proposed LDP will see further pressure on Tythe Barn Land and surrounding roads as it is not suited for the current vehicular volume - Once the new developments in neighbouring areas are complete, these will add
Q11	Mr Eric Homer [3721]		<p>Q 11 - Infrastructure Requirements at Blythe</p> <p>Infrastructure has not been upgraded to accommodate existing growth. The current infrastructure cannot support proposed development. The road infrastructure is inadequate and there are no alternative routes that could be built to relieve the situation. There are limits to how much GPs can expand in the area. Solihull hospital has been downgraded, resulting in having to utilise Heartlands hospital. Replacement of any lost sports provision will be required to an equivalent or better standard. No indication in the Plan. Loss of sports grounds/recreation areas for 9 clubs is contrary to Government Policy.</p>
Q11	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		<p>The extra housing will increase traffic and pollution. Bills Lane is narrow and too busy now.</p>
Q11	mr Graham Cockroft [5780]		<p>Most serious omission is the lack of any proposals to control flooding from watercourses or run-off. This is a very serious existing problem for Cheswick Green, and also for Dickens Heath..</p> <p>The need for a school to support development on other sites is not a sound reason to develop site 12.</p> <p>Many of the infrastructure proposals are no doubt well meant, but are very vague and non-specific, making it impossible to understand what is envisaged..</p>
Q11	Mr Hugh Swindell [5209]		<p>Objection to Sites 4 & 26:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Surrounding infrastructure needs to be improved at the same pace as new housing problems - These developments will drive further additional traffic through and already busy area including but not limited to neighbouring Major's Green.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mr Ivan Armstrong [5831]		<p>Concern regarding traffic around Haslucks Green Road/Bills Lane. (Turning from Bills Lane to Haslucks Green Lane should be RH only).</p> <p>Concern regarding traffic around Majors Green and current poor pedestrian/cycling access to station.</p> <p>Railway bridge Road is far too narrow for traffic and pedestrians with near misses from bus and lorry wing mirrors.</p> <p>The infrastructure of the whole area requires an independent safety consultants review.</p>
Q11	Mr J Davies [2104]		<p>Any development in this area will have knock-on effects in the Shirley area where road conditions are already chaotic and overcrowded - especially along Stratford Road and the retail park and car dealer areas.</p> <p>Shirley seems to have born the brunt of the housing plans which is grossly unfair as there have already been developments in that area which have adversely affected traffic flows, parking demand and school/medical services.</p> <p>There should be a much fairer spread on other areas of the borough.</p> <p>It does appear that the more wealthy areas have been spared whilst Shirley is being "dumped-on"</p>
Q11	Mr Jack Colling [5595]		<p>I OBJECT based on</p> <p>loss of greenbelt land, used by the community,</p> <p>save our wildlife..they were there first, we have no right to build here...</p> <p>area already very congested</p> <p>the roads are already full, we cannot accommodate more residents.</p> <p>we have no room at our schools and surgeries.</p> <p>what about our children? please save and protect this land</p>
Q11	Mr John Carter [5416]		<p>- My home is on Tanwoth Lane, south of the Miller and Carter.</p> <p>- In the two years since I moved here traffic during rush hours has increased significantly. Twice each day for in excess of 90 minutes I am more or less trapped in my house. It is almost imp</p>
Q11	Mr John Gibbs [5865]		<p>I don't believe that sufficient account has been taken of the effect on the road system around Shirley and Dickens Heath as a result of the addition of this high number of new dwellings.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mr John Ryland [5350]		<p>Objection to Site 26:</p> <p>Roads. The current road infrastructure is barely adequate for existing traffic, with both Bills Lane and Shakespeare Drive both regularly at a standstill during peak morning and afternoon periods. Lack of major employer locally will result in more commuter traffic.</p> <p>Rail. The current rail infrastructure is already overcrowded during peak periods, with both the Whitlocks End and Shirley station car parks at capacity.</p> <p>Flooding. The land for site 26 is at an elevation above Bills Lane and whenever there is heavy rain the spill off cascades down the lane to collect at the railway bridge.</p>
Q11	Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]		<p>Need to consider:</p> <p>Flood risk and mitigation</p> <p>Densities and plans drawn up to meet needs of the local population.</p> <p>Ensure sufficient funding to enable schools and medical practices to increase capacity or for new facilities</p> <p>Schools and medical facilities included in masterplans where necessary</p> <p>Brownfield sites considered first in accordance with WMCA policy and use of green belt as last resort</p> <p>Integration of green space and play areas, and incorporate views of local residents in design of developments.</p>
Q11	Mr Keith Oneill [5194]		<p>Objection to Sites 4 & 26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing volume of increased traffic is impacting on the immediate and surrounding areas, inc. Bills Lane, Haslucks Green Rd and through Major Green. - Roads were designed as country lanes and not for the constant use of residential and through traffic flow. - Loss of local sports grounds and no plans for adequate replacements. - Impact on Whitlocks end station and increased requirement of parking spaces. - Lack of proposed new amenities such as Doctors/ shops/schools etc.
Q11	Mr Mark Briers [5821]		<p>"Highway improvements" are undefined and I feel only new highways will help. To suggest that bike lanes are going to solve any congestion is ridiculous given our climate.</p>
Q11	Mr Mark Bruckshaw [3743]		<p>There is not enough investment in sufficient infrastructure to cope with the increase in traffic in this area.</p>
Q11	Mr Marshall Moses [3348]		<p>Development inappropriate without any change to infrastructure, particularly road/public transport impact.</p> <p>Any subsequent increase in traffic from Site 26 which will access/egress Bills Lane will require a pedestrian crossing to provided in Haslucks Green Road, Majors Green</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mr Martin Nash [5626]		I live in Major's Green and the infrastructure around is at bursting point. We cannot take on extra vehicles without an obverse effect on the country roads. There needs to be an alternative road(s) put in place to take the traffic away, <u>many use the roads at great speed as Rat Runs.</u>
Q11	Mr Matthew Lewis [5270]		- Much better and more infrastructure and facilities will be required if the plans go ahead (ie not just considered!) - Better walking routes to the station are great (and needed) however people still <u>want to drive and so more space at the station is req</u>
Q11	Mr Matthew Lewis [5332]		Objection to Site 4: - The addition of 350 houses would impact infrastructure in the area - School places and travel will not be able to sustain the amount of houses proposed. <u>- No improvement measures to infrastructure</u>
Q11	Mr Matthew Workman [2947]		Road infrastructure is diabolical and the local station cannot cope with the number <u>of people looking to park there.</u>
Q11	Mr Mike Nicholas [5495]		I live locally and worried Tythe Barn lane is inadequate. It is too narrow, poorly lit and underdeveloped to be able to cope with the impact of a new estate. I am worried about the the increased traffic on the local roads and the impact of the <u>estate on the community facilities.</u>
Q11	Mr N Walters [2802]		Infrastructure requirements have been needed since Dickens Heath was conceived 20 years ago! SMBC has done little to address the problems! New sites will only exacerbate the issues! Local infrastructure cannot cope with any more development, school is already oversubscribed with no area to expand. The village is slowly becoming subsumed into Shirley, Tidbury Green and Whitlocks End. Public transport continues to be woeful and residents are unhappy. Flooding is a real and increasing problem, it is notably absence in this consultation. <u>No discussion of weekly power cuts in Dickens Heath, low water pressure and</u>
Q11	Mr Neil Jeffries [5728]		I am concerned building more homes here will increase the volume of traffic on Bills Lane resulting in increased air pollution and road traffic accidents. Furthermore, I believe it will cause increased pressure on already stretched public services, especially local GP surgery. I do not believe building more homes on this site will lead to improved public transport links, just put more pressure on the existing services and increase the number of private car owners.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mr Paul Doyle [5244]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Latter stages of development in the village have had little regard to local road network - Have little confidence in the ability of the authority to manage any future development and increase in traffic - Recent increase in standing traffic must be attributed solely to recent housing developments - Consequent significant deterioration in air quality, especially close to school - Loss of playing pitches with no guarantee of replacement
Q11	Mr Paul Guggiari [5936]		<p>Traffic and road improvements are mentioned. However I am led to believe that this was also identified when Dickens Heath was first built, and all of the promised road improvements were never completed.</p> <p>I only see building of houses to the detriment to Sports, recreation and open space. It's easy to say they will be replaced with better facilities but I have seen no plans for this. Also the requirements will need to be substantially bigger than those at present to cater for the vast amount of more people using these facilities once the new houses are built.</p>
Q11	Mr Rajul Pankhania [5755]		<p>Traffic volumes are high already and with proposed development will cause more risk to unsafe roads as they currently stand. Current roads are not appropriate for current levels of traffic and pedestrians are already at risk. Recent development of Whitlocks End Train station car park have caused an increase in traffic volumes. I have already observed students being hit by car wing mirrors as they walk along the roads.</p> <p>This area is at high risk of flooding as per previous high precipitation observed. What is the plan to allow for this and to ensure that the water is managed correctly.</p>
Q11	Mr Robert Anderson [5468]		<p>Commuter roads for example Bills Lane and Tanworth lane are already very busy at peak times and over 2000 new homes will cause virtual grid lock!</p> <p>The local doctor surgeries are over subscribed.</p> <p>To maintain a green area for future generations area 13 must be ring fenced against future development.</p>
Q11	Mr Robert Beach [5883]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I object due to the increased traffic this will cause in an already busy area. - The pavements around Whitlocks Station are not safe for pedestrians to walk to the station nor would it be safe to cycle to on such busy roads. The station already can't

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mr Roger Grainger [5515]		<p>The sports fields are liable to flooding most years and this would exacerbate the flooding problem to neighbouring properties. The Site consists of deep boulder clay which does not drain well and dwellings would need to be built on deep piles. Dickens Heath School is already oversubscribed, and the demand for extra places will become vast.</p> <p>Extra people/traffic will exacerbate congestion through the Dickens Heath Village, on the A34 and surrounding roads especially at peak times. Parking at the station and in the village centre is already inadequate, and demands on local rail services will become critical.</p>
Q11	Mr Stephen Carter [2941]		<p>Schools already oversubscribed, how to accommodate 2500 new households? Dog Kennel Lane is either a standstill or a race track, exceeding speed limit of 40mph. Particularly congested at rush hour including surrounding roads. Traffic makes crossing roads difficult for pedestrians, especially Tanworth Lane towards Cheswick Green. Traffic on Tanworth Lane already increased since Mount Dairy Farm development.</p> <p>Previous correspondence with Council's Highways team about highway safety concerns.</p>
Q11	Mr Stuart Holder [5346]		<p>Objection to Site 12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The traffic in this area is already at breaking point and long delays are a common feature, particularly at peak times. The infrastructure is not in place and to add such a large number of additional homes simply does not make sense.
Q11	Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]		<p>NO</p> <p>New developments at Dickens Heath (Site 4) will reduce further the open countryside gap to Shirley coupled with the new site 26 leaves just the previous site 13 now designated POS as the only green space but is at risk of wash over until long term protection</p> <p>Even with site 13 removed a disproportionate 38% of the total borough allocations reside in Blythe villages.</p> <p>This also does not support any HS2 argument as Shirley is almost as far across the borough as you can get from the proposed HS2 stations before your enter Premecrove and Birmingham boundaries</p>
Q11	Mr Trevor Vaisey [5661]		<p>I fail to see how any development in this area can result in anything other than more traffic on the Stratford road, given this fact how is more traffic going to ease congestion on an already overwhelmed road</p>
Q11	Mr Tristram Oliver [5218]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection to Site 4 - Loss of sporting facilities - Inadequate re-provision for 3 sports clubs, new plans would only provide 2 pitches and currently at least 10, clubs will have to disband - Development will exacerbate existing flooding issues - Los

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mr Vincent Essex [5421]		<p>Objection to Site 12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I commute along Dog Kennel Lane daily, and traffic is absolutely awful along DKL towards the A34. - To add houses to the South of DKL would be catastrophic regardless of the amount of road improvements as with traffic heading heavily on both ways of the A34, coming out of Dickens Heath, traffic trying to get to various commercial and industrial parks along the A34 would make it gridlocked most days as it is now.
Q11	Mr. Matthew Dawson [5642]		<p>No where on the plans are any recreational lands, shops, leisure, medical or secondary school provisions, despite the area already being under-served.</p> <p>Little has been mentioned regarding sustainability or environmental impact, and current plans indicate a large reduction in green space & biodiversity</p>
Q11	Mrs Hayley Dyas [5722]		<p>Family living has not been taken into consideration.</p> <p>The Plan will have a negative impact on current living environment for residents of Blackford Road.</p> <p>Concerned about loss of trees and subsequent impact on air quality and noise. Very little thought given to open spaces and parks. The space currently provides somewhere to walk with the children due to the land and trees, if all of this is taken away and no parks or open space anywhere there will be no where to walk with young children. Every park is a car ride away which adds to pollution.</p>
Q11	Mrs Helen Houghton [3239]		<p>As a resident on Haslucks Green Road in Majors Green, I have to object about the potential increase in traffic which will be forced to go through our village due to extra housing. The already congested "Country Road" creates havoc getting off our driveway. Haslucks Green Road has become a "City Road", unsafe to walk through, noisy and polluted.</p> <p>Infrastructure desperately needs looking at Thank you</p>
Q11	Mrs Kashka Mandeville-Lewis [5331]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The addition of 350 houses would impact infrastructure in the area - School places and travel will not be able to sustain the amount of houses proposed. - No improvement measures to infrastructure

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mrs Victoria Moses [5648]		Impact of additional traffic on the safety of pedestrians due to the dangerous narrow pavements from Haslucks Green Road to Whitlocks End Station. Narrow /lack of pavements on Bills Lane, Haslucks Green Road, Peterbrook road to Aqueduct Road and Drawbridge Road. Dangerous to cross over Haslucks Green road or turn right at Rushleigh road. Already difficult to cross the road safely at Tilehouse Lane / Haslucks Green Road. Increased risk of flooding in Majors Green due to the development of additional housing the canal flooded over into gardens last year. Reduction in the green belt buffer between Bromsgrove and Solihull.
Q11	Mrs A Kidson [6259]		More pressure on resources and infrastructure.
Q11	Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]		There are high levels of car ownership and use, in the type of young people that buy homes on new developments. detailed traffic survey needs to be carried out, as not sure how roads can be improved without loss of ancient hedgerow and woodlands. All green spaces left need to be conected to allow wildlife to survive.
Q11	Mrs Andrea Wood [5321]		* Increased pressure on our roads and traffic * Poor broadband and mobile phone service * Fatal accident waiting to happen outside our schools with increase in traffic and pupils * Losing open spaces and local community facilities * This will lose the village feel * House prices will drop * Increased crime/struggle on police
Q11	Mrs Barbara Williams [5676]		. Don't agree with the amount of 38% of new housing being in the Shirley area. The infrastructure of drs, schools and roads around this areas will cause further problems. This new housing should be spread equally around the borough. The new Site 26 will mean more traffic on Bills Lane, it leaves a narrow gap between Dickens Heath and Shirley and in combination with the newly expanded Site 12 it will end up enclosing Site 13.
Q11	Mrs Brenda Clayson [5668]		Where will the green spaces be for local residents if the developments go ahead. The infrastructure, including local services like schools, libraries and health facilities are already overloaded and will not cope with additional development. The area is prone to flooding. Traffic congestion is already problematic. Need off road cycle paths, improve public transport, park and ride, utilise parking at Earlswood Railway, maintain and enhance sporting and recreational facilities.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]		- I agree that new infrastructure is needed, however particularly in the case of road infrastructure I don't see how this is possible nor have any suggestions how the council will achieve this been put forward. Bills Lane and the stretch of Haslucks Green
Q11	Mrs Carol Clarke [5822]		No given the amount of housing proposed in the Blythe villages the infrastructure will collapse The road network is at gridlock at peak times now with little scope given the surrounding topography to improve eg Haslucks Green Rd and Bills Lane Both Shirley & Whitlock's end train station car parks are over subscribed now with commuters parking in side roads where we have seen refuse collection lorries unable to pass
Q11	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		Some of the infrastructure needs are identified above in the statement. However, I cannot see the reasoning or sense in taking away playing fields and open spaces that exist with the wildlife in those areas that we see to then say in the statement that open spaces are required. This is a contradiction. Existing health provision is seriously stretched now and the Clinical Commissioning Group may not be up to date with what is happening now. It does not bode well for the future if Health Provision will be an after thought when the building happens.
Q11	Mrs Claire White [5399]		Objection to Site 12: - This is already a very busy residential area supporting heavy traffic to and from the M42 Junction 4. - Additionally Mercedes Benz have planning permission to build a new superstore showroom at the traffic island on the Stratford Road - how many more homes, businesses, cars and people can the area and it's infrastructure cope with? - The schools, GP's and local Hospitals already can't cope.
Q11	Mrs Diane Thornton [3107]		no consideration of increase of traffic on the current road system and public transport system, the Mott Macdonald plan was not obtained. Council state that public transport will be improved, however if there is no public transport now how can that be improved. There is already a lack of local GP's and pupils are already travelling far and wide due to lack of schools in the appropriate areas. There are no plans in the current draft for extra GPs and schools. The HSR report into the historic past of Blyth Valley has not been acknowledged by Solihull Council

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mrs Elizabeth Last [5368]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased traffic will exacerbate existing congestion through Dickens Heath village, on the A34 and surrounding roads - Extra demands on overcrowded rail services and inadequate parking - Loss of sports ground/recreation areas for 9 clubs - Adverse impact on ancient woodland and ecology - Existing flooding issues made worse, sports fields currently flood. - Pressure on primary school places at Dickens Heath school
Q11	Mrs Hazel Reed [3279]		<p>The development will increase traffic substantially on surrounding roads. As a Majors Green resident, my major concern is the upsurge in traffic which has already increased over the last 18 months from previous Dickens Heath developments. Traffic from this planned development will use already congested and dangerous roads through our village in order to access the motorway/other major roads quickly increasing pollution, noise and safety concerns.</p> <p>The current sports facilities are a well used facility for the local community and should be preserved.</p>
Q11	Mrs Helen Bolus [5216]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure in and around Dickens Heath already inadequate - Traffic through village increased considerably in last few years, can take 30mins to travel from Tythe Barn Lane to Miller and Carter roundabout in rush hour. <p>Village used as rat run from</p> <p>Cycling I don't cycle as it is too dangerous worse with more traffic.</p>
Q11	Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]		<p>Highway Extra traffic, more clogged and with your 'improvements' things will be at a standstill.</p> <p>Parking Only Dickens Heath? E.g Shirley, there are so many more cars on side roads in recent years. With extra residents, this is only going to get worse.</p> <p>Health No firm plan of how to deal with this</p> <p>School Secondary?</p> <p>S&R details? where will they be, who will fund etc?</p> <p>Green Belt - how is green belt enhanced, if you plan to build on it so much of it in one area?</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mrs Helen Lyman Smith [5533]		Local roads cannot cope during rush hours and are gridlocked. This is exacerbated by on-road parking on major routes through the village and a bottleneck at the Miller and Carter pub island. More housing will make this situation worse. The traffic infrastructure should be resolved now before new houses are built. Infrastructure comments do not adequately protect the integrity and infrastructure of Blythe villages. They are not being offered the same consideration or protection as villages such as Hockley Heath or Hampton-in-Arden, where greater consideration is being given to infrastructure yet fewer additional houses are being proposed.
Q11	Mrs Helen Lyman Smith [5533]		The comments in this section do not adequately protect the integrity and infrastructure of the villages of Dickens Heath, Cheswick Green and Tidbury Green. They are not being offered the same consideration or protection as villages such as Hockley Heath or Hampton-in-Arden, where greater consideration is being given to infrastructure yet fewer additional houses are being proposed. This is unacceptable to the residents of Blythe. I would ask the councillors and planning inspector to visit Dickens Heath during the morning rush hour before making any decisions - you will see how unworkable these proposals are.
Q11	Mrs Janet Anderson [5474]		Generally I agree, but I do have concerns about the congestion extra traffic will bring to Bills Lane, Haslucks Green Road & Tamworth Lane areas. Already at various times of the day its impossible to navigate these roads without huge traffic delays. With the addition of 4000 extra cars, the outlook will be grim. Its hard now to get a doctors appointment, with the added pressure of an extra 2050 houses to accommodate, how can this be addressed? To ensure Area 13 remains green for future generations, it could be made into a nature reserve or similar.
Q11	Mrs Jayne Bott [5774]		Infrastructure is already at breaking point. Haslucks Green Road and Bills Lane already over loaded with cars. Numerous accidents by Whitlocks End Station where Haslucks Green Road meets Tilehouse Lane and at the hump back bridge over the canal past The Drawbridge pub. Often a queue of traffic along Haslucks Green Road before the bend by Whitlocks End Station. Take your life in your hands if walking in any direction from the train station. Trying to be seen by a local doctor is also very difficult, this will also get harder, particular a problem for the elderly and unwell.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		<p>Comments refer to Dickens Heath: Disagree new development will "add to the vibrancy and vitality of the settlement, whilst retaining the intrinsic character of distinctive villages separated by open countryside." High car ownership in area and will be low uptake of public transport Car Park at Whitlocks End station is full at 8am. Walking and cycling will be reduced as cannot access Birchy Close. Highways improvements will not be feasible on 20mph roads. More off-street parking in Dickens Heath will be difficult to achieve. Lack of firm proposals to replace sports pitches.</p>
Q11	Mrs Judith Chivers [3803]		<p>Public transport improvements do not include routing of buses and the network of roads for their travel.</p> <p>Insufficient inclusion of aspects related to Whitlocks End station: car parking, footpaths, lighting, access and egress.</p> <p>Impact of shifting traffic movements to Tilehouse Lane, Haslucks Green Road, Bills Lane already under high levels of traffic flow. No information regarding the impact of the Plan on these roads and pavements some of which are outside Borough. What are the views of Bromsgrove Council on the plans for Site 4?</p>
Q11	Mrs Julia finnegan [5742]		<p>Shirley is being over developed at a rapid rate. Infrastructure is not there to support this influx of population particularly roads and healthcare . In the solihull region shirley including Dickens heath has seen the highest rate of development . Green space is becoming more and more limited including potential loss of sports amenities. Other areas of the region should be considered as an alternative</p>
Q11	Mrs Katie Pile [5502]		<p>The local services and roads/ parking at stations is already insufficient. With the extra housing, this will spiral out of control</p>
Q11	Mrs Kealie Ahmad [6155]		<p>The proposals do not take account of already huge committed development in addition to those sites which are proposed here under Amber. eg Blythe Valley Park housing estate, the extensions to Cheswick Green, the Service Station at junction 4, plus the proposed Amber sites, means that Illshaw heath Road and Warings Green Road in the protected area need to be changed to dual carriageways to deal with all the increased amount of traffic travelling between these extended urban developments, the HS2 hub, the service stations. The plans make no provision for what the area "will be";. Infrastructure needs are underestimated.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mrs Linda Homer [3729]		<p>Infrastructure has not been upgraded to accommodate existing growth. The current infrastructure cannot support proposed development. The road infrastructure is inadequate and there are no alternative routes that could be built to relieve the situation. There are limits to how much GPs can expand in the area. Solihull hospital has been downgraded, resulting in having to utilise Heartlands hospital. Replacement of any lost sports provision will be required to an equivalent or better standard. No indication in the Plan. Loss of sports grounds/recreation areas for 9 clubs is contrary to Government Policy.</p>
Q11	Mrs Lindsey Mason [5513]		<p>Concern re the huge number of houses planned (2050) This number of additional families and their cars will have a huge impact on the already congested roads around Shirley and increase pollution. Additional concerns include: loss of access to green belt land, even less access to health professionals, added pressure on already crowded and underfunded schools, loss of sports ground and areas to play, impact on wildlife, limited parking at stations and flooding.</p>
Q11	Mrs Margaret Dempsey [5630]		<p>The roads are narrow and are little more than country lanes and cannot cope with the amount of traffic that is currently using them, Also I have concerns that there is <u>no capacity at local schools or GP surgeries.</u></p>
Q11	Mrs Nicola Brown [5219]		<p>- The road infrastructure of Dickens Heath simply would not cope with an increased traffic, it doesn't cope now with the traffic flow. - To plan to solve that by simply stating that more off street parking would be provided is neither feasible neither w</p>
Q11	Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]		<p>Affordable housing in Solihull is an issue, even the smallest home is out of reach for most first time buyers. I have a mobility scooter, that I would like to use more. Poor pavements, poor crossing on side streets, cars for Shirley station parked also on side streets making visibility to cross difficult. Narrow pavements and very busy roads don't help. No access to green belt land for the disabled.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	mrs Pamela Reda [5724]		<p>Loss of sports ground / recreation areas for 9 clubs which is contrary to Govt. policy</p> <p>Demands on already crowded local rail services & inadequate parking at the station & village centre</p> <p>Liable to flooding already - this area when developed will deteriorate surrounding areas particularly in Dickens Heath</p> <p>Demand for places at Dickens Heath school which is oversubscribed already.</p> <p>90% of respondents to the last Dickens Heath Parish Council survey objected to site 4</p> <p>Dickens Heath & Tidbury Green have already taken their fair share of development during the last Local Plan allocations</p>
Q11	Mrs Rebecca Reade [3449]		<p>This new development will increase the congestion we already experience in Shirley.</p> <p>Doctors appointments are difficult to book due to increased number of patients at my surgery, Haslucks medical centre.</p> <p>The traffic in Shirley, especially during peak times is getting worse, particularly Stratford Road.</p> <p>I am concerned about the impact this will have on pollution in the area and for my children in the future.</p> <p>Could Allocation 13 be changed to a nature reserve, somewhere for our children to</p>
Q11	Mrs Sally Cridland [5819]		<p>I am so concerned of the number of new houses that are being planned for building in the near future.</p> <p>I have resided at 510 Haslucks Green Road for almost 40 years and during that time the road has become more like a race track and find it very difficult to enter or leave my drive with the amount fast traffic, if the proposed houses that are being considered built where is traffic that will also arise as the road cannot cope with what has grown over the last number of years</p> <p>The speed on the road is dangerous</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		<p>1. Impact on traffic congestion on all roads but especially Stratford Road given planned housing near A34. Major issue as A34 already very congested.</p> <p>2. Impact on already crowded rail services needs to be addressed as well as parking at local stations and village centres. Whitlocks End and Shirley stations are currently operating at full capacity.</p> <p>3. The GP practices are already now difficult to access. There is a national shortage of GPs. Local Hospital resources have been diminished.</p> <p>4. Green open spaces will be lost as part of proposed developments. Where will local residents go?</p> <p>5. Detrimental impact on Local Green belt and landscape character</p>
Q11	Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]		<p>Cycle paths in Solihull lack connectivity, many are just marked line lines along very busy roads. we need good off road cycle routes that connect to main shopping areas and railway stations with good cycle parking in appropriate places.</p> <p>Congestion on all roads from south shirley to the stratford road, haslucks green road, bills lane, shakespear drive, tanworth lane, blackford road and dog kennel lane are all way over capacity at peak times. Not sure what help putting in speed reductions on the stratford road will do when the traffic only crawls at very low speeds at peak times.</p>
Q11	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parking insufficient at Whitlocks End Station, full at 8am for commuters - Insufficient school places - GP oversubscribed - Local flooding issues - Roads gridlocked - Site 26 should be used for station parking
Q11	Mrs Sylvia Gardiner [5398]		<p>The requirements for the infrastructure of so many houses in the Drythe area would be impossible to construct..</p> <p>38% of the build in approximately 24% of the green belt with roads already heavily congested and the limited availability of widening the roads etc. 2050 new homes creating 4,000 additional cars. With 2,000 new retirement flats/homes already completed in the area not even counted in the percentage. This is totally unfair.</p> <p>Pollution levels, limited parking at station, ancient hedgerows, no cycle paths in an area that is more populated anywhere else in the Solihull Borough, Open space, sports amenities and flooding</p>
Q11	Mrs Wendy Murphy [5694]		<p>Building homes on this green space site will create more traffic problems for the area. Bills Lane regularly has traffic jams during the morning rush hour and at times during the day it is difficult trying to cross the road on foot.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Ms Denise Davies [5392]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure, such as parking, GP surgery, local shops, cannot cope with extensions to Dickens Heath - Will cause traffic chaos and add unbearable burden on traffic in already congested area - No realistic provision of alternative sports facilities
Q11	Ms Nicole Geoghegan [5643]		<p>The entire road system in and around Dickens Heath is now insufficient and dangerous - even with the existing population.</p> <p>A small number of leasees are responsible for the maintenance, renewal, operational expenses, etc of a number of communal sites/facilities in Dickens Heath. The legal structure put in place some 10+years ago relating to these Common Assets is not tenable with further development around Dickens Heath. Buildings in Dickens Heath subject to recent flooding, contributed to by the lack of balancing ponds in/around the village. Further development of current farmland/undeveloped land around Dickens Heath can only exacerbate flooding risk.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Open Spaces Society (Mr Richard Lloyd) [5451]		<p>Play and open space provision - requirements for the provision of play spaces as part of potential development sites should be extended across the Borough. standards should be established with regard to the scale of provision; nearness to dwellings; phasing within the Plan period; the type and quantity of play equipment; lighting, over-looking and physical security; the segregation of public access from ecological areas; and the process for the adoption of these areas by the Local Authority</p> <p>Master plan approach is welcomed, but should be extended to all part of the Borough. the master plans need to become more tightly defined during the further development of the Local Plan. Should show how the policies elsewhere in the Local Plan are to be implemented in each specific site. Should be clear allocation and protection of areas for public access, should be secured in perpetuity by the dedication of the land as a Village Green, or by dedication of access rights under section 16 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. There is no mention in the Draft Plan of the designation of Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF para 99</p> <p>In terms of green belt enhancements Potential improvements should be seen in the context of the agricultural use of much of the land, and of the prevailing Solihull Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2016 (ROWIP). Best possible standards and practice should be applied for the physical state of the path network. Registration of unrecorded access rights should be encouraged and expedited. The Local Plan should also define how funding derived from developers will be applied to the other aspects of enhancements to the Green Belt.</p>
Q11	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposals for residential sites (12, and 26) in Shirley are within Green belt - Proposals for 1940 additional homes (sites 11,12 and 26) increases the population (census 2011) by more than 38%. - State funding for a new primary school should be financ

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Paul Hamer [3395]		I appreciate the need for more housing, but there is still a huge issue of the infrastructure being unable to cope with the pressure on this area of Shirley. Particularly with and extra 800 cars twice a date at peak times on Bills Lane (which already has had a fatal accident and many serious accidents). The area of Shirley is already gridlocked as Cllr Ken Hawkins has pointed out.
Q11	Paul J Dufrane [4410]		No consideration for the increase in traffic The council state that public transport will be improved, however if there is no public transport now how can that be improved Lack of local GP's and pupils are already travelling far and wide due to lack of schools in the appropriate areas
Q11	Paula Pountney [4579]		- Loss of sports grounds and playing fields. - With 2000 new homes there will be 4000 extra cars, the roads in Shirley are already congested. - This will cause gridlock and already limited parking at stations. - There is no recognition of existing
Q11	Paula Pountney [4579]		We think it is unfair that 38% of the housing is being built in Shirley. The roads are already congested with traffic jams in the area. With 2050 new houses there will be 4000 more cars on the road causing increased air pollution. There will be additional pressure on G.P. capacity, schools and other amenities. We agree with the expert view of Jean Walters, see attached document. What we need:- Improved public transport including a park and ride. Earlswood railway station offers plenty of parking. Off road cycle paths. Allocation 13 changed from public open space to a Nature Reserve.
Q11	Paula Price [4498]		Objection to Sites 4 and 26: - Loss of local sporting facilities - Loss of parkland and recreation areas - Existing area overcrowded with high volume of traffic. 750 new homes means 1500+ more cars. - Highway safety issues - bad bend on Haslucks Green Road. Already been a number of accidents, resulting in bollards, warning signs and anti-skid surface. Can often hear speeding traffic. Roads are dark and narrow and speeding signs not adhered to. - Whitlocks End station carpark already inadequate, need to use car as roads

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		<p>Comments Site Promoter of CFS130 in Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ideally located for pedestrian and cycling connectivity improvements - Further enhance traffic calming on Tythe Barn Lane - Can provide sufficient off-street parking - S106 contributions to Tidbury Green primary school - Potential financial contributions to health services - Will not require replacement of sports facilities - Opportunity to provide public open space, play areas and green infrastructure - Green Belt enhancements possible - Potential CIL - Can deliver much needed affordable housing
Q11	Peter & Elaine King [3262]		<p>A lot more consideration needs to be given to coping with already congested traffic situations. School places need to be given considerable consideration. Will this cause problems with the number of places available at Doctors surgeries because they are already stretched to breaking point.</p>
Q11	Robert Street [5747]		<p>The road infrastructure is inadequate; as is the drainage and there is past history of flooding even to those newbuild house recently constructed on the corner of Cleobury Lane. Playing fields will be massively reduced to only 2 no. pitches which would be not enough to resource the current facilities. Many current houses are built on piled foundations which would impact on any newbuild costs. Wildlife will be affected such as small deer which numbers have reduced severely over recent years.</p>
Q11	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>No objection in principle on infrastructure however, the current lack of traffic assessments make it difficult to adequately assess what highway improvements are necessary and impact on the choice of sites and site alternatives.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Severn Trent Water (Elaine Ring) [6241]		<p>Severn Trent Water response: Results of our high level sewer capacity assessment highlights some possible risks of the proposed development on the sewerage and surface water network. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead.</p> <p>Medium impact sites in Blythe: - West of Dickens Heath - TRW/ The Green - South of Dog Kennel Lane</p>
Q11	Sheetal Sharma [6257]		<p>Congestion on local roads. Flooding issues. Parking problems in Dickens Heath Village Centre Green Space.</p>
Q11	Simon Taylor [4550]		<p>Disagree with the infrastructure requirements of the Blythe area because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The trainline from Whitlocks End is already over-capacity during 'rush-hour' times, has a limited schedule at certain times of the day (twice an hour after 6pm), and has an already stretched car park - References additional off-street car parking in Dickens Heath, yet it ignores the current strain on roads around Dickens Heath as a result of on-street parking - Current infrastructure around Blythe is currently not fit to take the strain of the additional proposed housing and the proposed changes do not fully address this
Q11	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		<p>Infrastructure Requirements - we agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Blythe - members emphasised the need to address the Highways congestion specifically at the Millar & Carter/Tanworth Lane Traffic Islands that also cause lengthy peak morning delays in Tanworth Lane and Stretton Road in addition to vehicles exiting Dickens Heath Road from the village. The need for additional off-street parking at Dickens Heath village was also highlighted</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	South Solihull Community Group (Sylvia Gardiner) [5777]		<p>already extensive road traffic - especially at peak times 2050 new homes creates 4000 new cars pollution levels rising from congestion limited parking at rail stations road improvements restricted by hedgerows additional pressure on GP practices adequacy of school places loss of sporting amenities large areas of Blythe prone to flooding loss of irreplaceable green belt</p> <p>Suggestions for mitigation: site 13 being upgraded from POS to nature reserve expansion of off road cycle routes sustainable public transport more park and ride spaces</p>
Q11	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle on infrastructure however, the current lack of traffic assessments makes it difficult to adequately assess what highway improvements are necessary and impact on the choice of sites and site alternatives.
Q11	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		Stratford-on-Avon District Council is concerned that development in Blythe could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.
Q11	Summix (FHS) Developments Ltd [4455]	Framptons Planning (Mr Greg Mitchell) [2685]	Chapter 6 Blythe fails to provide fair or reasonable assessment of Tidbury Green as a potential development location, as it downplays the settlement's sustainability credentials and ignores proposals to upgrade Wythall rail station and train service frequency. As a result, the SDLP pre-determines the spatial strategy inappropriately, based on inadequate evidence.
Q11	Taylor Wimpey [579]	Lichfields (Zoe Simmonds) [5575]	Acknowledge need for improvements to public transport, a new primary school, and if assessed as needed, new health facilities. Supportive of provision of mix of market and affordable housing and range of types and sizes of homes, subject to meeting demand and not saturating the market.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	Terry Clayson [4147]		<p>Where will the green spaces be for local residents if the developments go ahead. The infrastructure, including local services like schools, libraries and health facilities are already overloaded and will not cope with additional development. The area is prone to flooding. Traffic congestion is already problematic. We need: Off road cycle paths, allocation 13 changed to a nature reserve, improved public transport, park and ride, utilising parking at Earlswood Station, maintain and enhance sporting and recreational facilities.</p>
Q11	TG Autos sarah Guest [3447]		<p>Proposed build would equal thousands more cars, Unfair % in Blythe Valley, Already bad congestion would become ridiculous, more stress would be put on accident hot spots. Ancient hedgerows & current developments mean no room to improve roads. Cycling & walking route are already dangerous with current traffic levels, no room for improvements. Loss of sports grounds, having detrimental impact on health of residents. GP capacities already under immense pressure, national shortage of GPs. Pollution levels, Concerns as these areas already flood frequently, Limited statoin parking.</p>
Q11	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>No objection in principle on infrastructure however, the current lack of traffic assessments makes it difficult to adequately assess what highway improvements are necessary and impact on the choice of sites and site alternatives.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	The Shakespeare Line Promotion Group (Mr Fraser Pithie) [6056]		<p>Wythall and Whitlocks End Stations should be considered holistically due to the following: the need for connectivity between the two authority areas (Bromsgrove and Solihull), Birmingham City Centre and the wider West Midlands, the level of passenger demand at the two stations and different train frequencies, the impact on Whitlocks End caused by no parking at Wythall, proposed scale of housing will place significant pressure upon the rail network, benefits of a holistic approach would extend to Earlswood and Shirley.</p> <p>Community of Dickens Heath as well as a wider area relies on Whitlocks End to access the railway network. It is the busiest unstaffed station in the West Midlands area. Existing car parking is oversubscribed every day causing potential users to commute by car adding to vehicular congestion. Additional residential development will require facilities and infrastructure at Whitlocks End to be significantly enhanced. Supports the improvement of pedestrian and cycling facilities between Whitlocks End and Dickens Heath, there can be no upgrade of parking without the grade separation of pedestrians and vehicles which use the Tilehouse Lane over bridge. Paragraph 132 is not robust enough in terms of supporting better train services and enhanced transport infrastructure using Community Infrastructure levy powers.</p> <p>Future housing development at Blythe should financially support the improvement of rail services and a bigger car park providing 200/250 spaces. There should be co-operation between Solihull and Bromsgrove authorities to enable a joint strategy to be developed which addresses the railway station housing catchments for Earlswood, Wythall, Whitlocks End and Shirley.</p>
Q11	Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss Charlotte Kirby) [2531]		<p>Do not agree. Significant new development will not retain distinctive character of individual settlements. Disagree with public transport comments as high level of car ownership, bus services seldom used and rail over capacity at peak times. Agree with cycling/walking links to station, but requires access using Birchy Close, opposed by Residents Association. Agree highway improvements required, but cannot be provided as road speed restricted/densely developed and will impact on ancient woodland. No traffic studies published. Parking improvements referenced are vague and impossible to achieve. No firm alternative pitches proposed. Support country park on old Site 13 as green belt enhancement.</p>
Q11	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		<p>There is a requirement in this area for 'River Blythe Enhancements' which we recommend are added to this section.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q11	West Midlands Police (Chief Constable) [5044]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The absence of positive references to the need to provide Police infrastructure undermines the delivery of safe and secure development. There should be express reference to the need for financial contributions towards additional expenditure burden placed on WM Police as a consequence of the proposed growth. Seek engagement in preparation of Concept Masterplans and policy implementation and delivery once Plan adopted.
Q11	Worcestershire County Council (Ben Horovitz) [6246]		<p>It is clear that several suggested allocations will have an impact on Worcestershire's transport network. Some of the specific current issues that need to be considered are:</p> <p>Access to Strategic Network/A Class roads: The nearest motorway junctions are M42 J3 and J4, with both having known capacity constraints</p> <p>Local roads: Local roads are currently at capacity and transport modelling is necessary to understand the capacity of the local roads to accommodate further traffic generated from new development</p> <p>Rail Infrastructure and Services: Parking capacity at stations along the corridor is poor, as is the level of service provided. Should investigate replacing smaller stations on Shakespeare Line with a larger station.</p> <p>Education: Woodrush Community High School in Worcestershire has direct links with the adjacent Dickens Heath area, as Tidbury Green Primary School in Solihull is a named school for pupil admissions. Any housing proposals for this area may impact secondary school provision in Worcestershire. WCC's Children, Families and Communities directorate would welcome opportunity to be included in any future consultations on housing/education.</p>
Q11	Zoe Murtagh [3083]		I honestly understand there is a need for housing as our population grows ever larger however I am disgusted at how much 'green belt' land in Shirley/Blythe area is having to donate to the cause. It seems we have the lions share of new housing developments on our door step (mine particularly being directly opposite the proposed site 11 & 12)! The field behind my house becomes more like the wetlands in heavy rainfall and i have deep concern the overload of housing proposed on site 12 will have an adverse effect on the flood zone 2 & 3.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Blythe			
Q12	Agnes Thomas [5386]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green have already taken their 'fair share' of development. - Extra people/traffic will exacerbate congestion through Tidbury Green, especially at peak times - Sports fields are liable to flooding and would exacerbate the flo
Q12	Akamba Heritage Centre (Mr Chris Canaan) [5539]		<p>Adverse impacts of developing the site do not outweigh the benefits of providing houses near a railway station.</p> <p>Loss of high performing Green Belt and coalescence with neighbouring areas.</p> <p>Loss of sports grounds/recreation areas.</p> <p>Loss of Village character, contrary to the original concept of Dickens Heath.</p> <p>Unsustainable site: not linked to Dickens Heath and out on a limb.</p> <p>Impact on landscape character.</p> <p>Ancient woodland requires suitable semi-natural buffer.</p> <p>Adverse impact on ecology and potential loss of habitats of legally protected species.</p> <p>Welcome retention of Akamba Garden Centre.</p> <p>The area has already taken its 'fair share' of development during recent years.</p>
Q12	Andrew Harfoot [6281]		<p>Only justification is location close to Whitlocks End railway station but detailed analysis shows it is not sustainable. Should be red not green given sustainability analysis.</p> <p>Developing land west of Dickens Heath makes proposal wholly inappropriate in terms of sound planning, and both national and local planning policies.</p> <p>Site lies outside Dickens Heath village and has no direct physical connection to it.</p> <p>Site 4 is a high performing Green Belt site & the land is liable to flooding.</p> <p>There would be loss of wildlife, character and identity in Dickens Heath, and a loss playing fields with no alternative proposals submitted.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Ann Marie Reohorn [5566]		Impact of additional congestion on already unsuitable roads. Impact on Green Belt, character of the area and key landscape features. Impact on ecology. Significant local objection. Additional demand on Whitlocks End station leading to parking issues, congestion and pollution.
Q12	Bloor Homes [6243]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	Support the inclusion of Site 4 West of Dickens Heath as an allocation. Although located in a moderately performing parcel of Green Belt, the site is opportunely located in very close proximity to Whitlock's End Train Station as well as being within walking distance to key facilities and services to make it sustainable. It is unclear how this site parcels 176 and 126 in the Site Assessment Document are 'green sites' when site 192 immediately adjacent site has been scored 'red'. Further clarification is sought as Site 192 performs equally well.
Q12	Charlotte Weston [6176]		Destruction of ancient woodland and local wildlife sites is unacceptable, and it is crucial these are retained. It would be disappointing if existing football and rugby clubs were demolished. These are key community assets and support health outcomes - losing this would be detrimental to the local community. Significant concerns over Persimmon given their poor build quality, incompleteness of communal areas and hidden charges. Given government are reviewing their ability to participate in the Help to Buy scheme due to concerns - I would expect the council not to accept a proposal from Persimmon.
Q12	Christine Street [4315]		Objection to Site 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of sports facilities not in public interest - Insufficient parking in the area - insufficient spaces already at Whitlocks End station and at the shops in Dickens Heath. - The infrastructure cannot cope with more traffic through Dickens Heath in the mornings/evenings and as a cut through when there are problems on the M40/M42. - Muntjac deer, protected under 1991 Deer Act, will be lost on the Old Yardleians site - Local wildlife needs protecting - The fields currently already flood every Winter and whenever there is heavy

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Cllr Adam Kent [5204]		As the County Councillor for Wythall which is right next to the proposed site I would ask that serious consideration is given to the unsuitability of the surrounding roads to accomodate these houses. Already narrow adjacent residential roads are blocked by overspill parking from Whitlocks End Station. The bridge over the railway adjacent to Whitlocks End station is unsuitable, dangerous and narrow and the junction of Haslucks Green Road and Peterbrook Road has constant accidents due to its tight bend and excessive speeds. Peterbrook Rd is narrow and already getting dangerous levels of traffic as is Haslucks Green Rd.
Q12	Cllr Adam Kent [5204]		Recognise reduction in numbers on Site 4, but not considered to mitigate overriding concerns regarding impact on local road network through to Majors Green in Bromsgrove and pressure on Whitlocks End Station car park. Detailed comments and images are in the attached document.
Q12	Councillor K Hawkins [2174]		Petition objecting to Allocation 4 of the LDP Review. Online petition signed by 1150 people. Site will see the development of 350 homes, will be built on land that incorporates three sports clubs, with several playing pitches (rugby and football) The proposals show the replacement of just two playing pitches - this is contrary to SMBC's Planning Policy P20, which require at least a re-provision or replacement of such recreational facilities. In addition , the already gridlocked roads of Dickens Heath Majors Green and Shirley will not be able to accommodate the extra traffic this development will bring.
Q12	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Uncertainty over location of replacement sportsfields, which need to be within their communities and retain distinctiveness of individual clubs. Whilst site offers potential of connecting Dickens Heath with Whitlocks End station with public transport, masterplan provides no viable means of delivery. Inadequate reference to importance of irreplaceable ancient woodland at Little Tyburn Coppice, which requires far greater protection than individual trees. Significant traffic problems in the neighbouring environs. Not adequately addressing sustainable nor active transport to reduce car dependency as demonstrated in the masterplan.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>Site 4 should be reduced to the land between Hine Barn Lane and the Stratford Canal west of the Whitchurch Lane area of Dickens Heath (c.100 dwellings). The rest of Site 4 should be omitted from the Local Plan.</p> <p>Objection based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents objections in Dickens Heath PC survey Disproportionate housing allocation in Blythe ward Impact on Green Belt Conflict with urban form of Dickens Heath new village Unsustainable location (low accessibility to services) Increased traffic will worsen peak-hour congestion Limited scale of replacement of sports pitches Impact on Local Wildlife Sites Impact on historic landscape and important hedgerows <p>Allocation chosen due to its location close to Whitlocks End railway station. The allocation does not accord, or can be made to accord with the spatial strategy and sequential approach adopted in the Local Plan Review. Analysis of the sustainability and constraints of this Site are flawed and inaccurate. not consistent with the paragraph on how settlements have green belt separating them, because this proposal will reduce the gap to one field only which is not green belt. Other sites in the Borough with a lower Green Belt scoring are more suitable for development.</p> <p>results of Dickens Heath residents survey found (over 90%) that the residents of Dickens Heath are strongly opposed to the proposed allocation of Site 4. Excessive housing proposed compared with elsewhere in the Borough, so does not contribute to geographical distribution. This is an excessive burden placed on such a small area without the ability to improve the road network accordingly. Allocation does not accord with government policy on green belt. The Council has not fully examined the infrastructure requirements that would justify and mitigate altering the Green Belt in this location. There would be an adverse impact on the function of the Green Belt, as there would be coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlock End and Majors Green. Development of Site 4, not within recognised walking distance (800m) of the Village Centre and outside the strong natural boundaries of the Village would be contrary to the original objectives of the settlement. Former</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Daniel Edwards [5926]		<p>The only reason for the choice of this site for new housing is its location close to Whitlocks End railway station but detailed analysis shows that it is not sustainable</p> <p>Developing the land west of Dickens Heath makes the proposal wholly inappropriate in terms of sound planning practice</p> <p>Dickens Heath has increased from the original design of 850 dwellings to approximately 1,800 units</p> <p>Narrow roads and historic hedgerows will make it difficult to make sufficient road improvements to take much more traffic</p> <p>The site is not within walking distance from the facilities in the Village</p> <p>Site is a high performing Green Belt site, local wildlife sites surround the site and <u>landscape sensitive to development</u></p>
Q12	David Harvey [5262]		<p>- My major concern about the proposed development is its impact on local roads.</p> <p>- Route to and from Tilehouse Lane via Tythe Barn Lane is already very congested at rush hour.</p> <p>- At these times it is extremely difficult to get out of the village notably</p>
Q12	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	<p>Site 4 - west of Dickens Heath poses particular concern. Well-used existing sporting pitches cannot be re-provided on-site and will require alternative provision. Alternative sites would still need to meet Green Belt tests, e.g. for floodlighting.</p> <p>SHELAA Site 209 performs much more highly in comparison, no LWS, no Ancient Woodland, no playing pitches, no hard constraints, and no soft constraints that will affect development.</p>
Q12	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	<p>Site 4 proposes the redevelopment of existing sports pitches which are well used without appropriate plans in place for the re-provision of this local facility. It is noted that the identification of a Local Wildlife Site within the site hampers re-provision within the site itself and therefore alternative options will need to be pursued.</p> <p>We consider that these alternatives should be considered, especially as alternatives within Green Belt, which may, for example, include floodlighting, will have to be carefully considered against the Green Belt 'tests'.</p> <p>Understand loss of these facilities, with no real alternatives proposed, is causing particular local concern.</p>
Q12	Derek Forsythe [4121]		<p>- Accept that SMBC need to meet their housing requirements as required by the Government.</p> <p>- Welcome proposed reduction from 700 to 350 houses and decision not to proceed with the Sports Stadium.</p> <p>- As a resident of Majors Green my overriding concern is</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		<p>In principle the Parish Council welcomes reduced housing numbers but has objections over site 4 that is strongly opposed by the community. Scheme would have to respect woodlands, hedgerows & openness which characterises the area. Views dependent on details of the final scheme. There is clear obligation for the re-provision of permanent sports pitches for local clubs within the area, as existing facilities offer good access, public transport links and parking, to better safeguard the future of the clubs with improved community facilities while retaining a pleasant approach to village.</p> <p>Concept Masterplan Welcome reduced house numbers on site 4 and replacement of site 13 by site 26 on reduced scale.</p>
Q12	Dickens Heath Residents Association (Trevor Eames) [6245]		<p>Welcome reduction in housing numbers at Site 4, but objection to this site based on residents' feedback and lack of information to address existing traffic and infrastructure issues.</p> <p>Very widespread strong objections by the village to Site 4 Masterplan proposals. No confidence that proposals will ease existing traffic and parking issues. Loss of original Dickens Heath Village concept. Note Council's laudable intentions to protect landscape features. Residents opposed to relocation of long established sports grounds for Old Yardleians Rugby Club, Highgate United FC, and Leaffield FC. Clubs have significant local support. Alternative provision must be adequate standard within Site 4.</p>
Q12	Dr Neeta Manek [5239]		<p>- I live on Tythebarn Lane near Akamba and the proposed site. - Major traffic congestion problems on Tythe Barn lane at the moment in and out of the Dickens Heath village more houses in the plan with more cars will make it impossible to get out of my dr</p>
Q12	Dr Sophie McDowall [5311]		<p>- Incongruous effect of housing and an urban style sports centre in this area - More appropriate sites on lower grade Green Belt - Increase in traffic - Adverse impact on local ecology including needing a protective buffer to ancient woodland - Advers</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		<p>The site falls within Flood Zone 1, however there appears to be an ordinary watercourse near the western boundary of the site with its source at Betteridges Barn and then it is culverted under the Sport Pavilion Ground and Tythe Barn Lane. As our 'Flood Map for Planning' only shows the flood risk from watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km², mapping of the risk from the watercourse has not been undertaken and as such this is the only reason the site is shown to lie in low risk Flood Zone 1. The assessment of flood risk and easement from the ordinary watercourse should be agreed with the LLFA, however we strongly recommend that hydraulic modelling of the watercourse is undertaken as part of a Level 2 SFRA to inform of the developable area and capacity of this potential allocation. In addition, this area has known flooding issues and Solihull MBC as the LLFA are investigating potential options to reduce flood risk within Dickens Heath. As a result the LLFA should be allowed to comment further regarding this as any development in this location could provide flood storage and should help reduce flood risk downstream. We recommend that a Level 2 SFRA is undertaken to consider how development in this area could alleviate existing flood risk issues. Regardless of flood risk, we recommend an unobstructed green corridor is maintained along the banks of the watercourse for the purposes of protecting and maintaining green and blue infrastructure.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Fiona Hunter [5973]		<p>I would like to object to this development and I attach my objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green have disproportionately high share of housing proposals. - Adverse impacts of site outweigh positive of being near a railway station - High performing Green Belt would be lost contrary to national policy. - Significant loss of sports fields contrary to government policy. - Additional traffic on already congested roads - consequent effect on air quality - Whitlocks End rail service is already well used and parking inadequate - Award winning design of Dickens Heath would be lost. - Ecology of the area/ Wildlife sites would be adversely impacted - Flooding (in 2018) would be exacerbated. - Impact on landscape character - Tithe Barn Wood is a most significant area of Ancient Woodland and would require a significant buffer from any development thus reducing size of the site - 90% of Dickens Heath residents (in survey by Parish Council) objected to site - Dickens Heath School already oversubscribed - Site does not perform well against the factors identified in the Council's refinement Criteria with the DLP and should be classified as 'red'.
Q12	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Would result in coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlocks End and Majors Green. Site is highly visually sensitive in landscape terms. Development would be an ill-thought out addition to the west of Dickens Heath and have no relationship to the original concept or masterplan.</p> <p>Masterplan makes no reference to how the site would complement or enhance Dickens Heath and it is acknowledged that further work is needed to identify links to the Village Centre.</p> <p>Site 4 has been dismissed as an allocation numerous times.</p> <p>No identified sites for the relocation of Sports pitches.</p> <p>No evidence of highway impact of the development.</p>
Q12	Graham Thomas [5387]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant impact on the highly performing green belt, which would be lost contrary to government policy. - Loss of playing pitches, which is contrary to government policy. - Loss of village character that makes it attractive. Site 4 is unsustainable

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	H Reed [4641]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No plans for drainage and flood prevention in what is part of a natural valley, risking current and future properties. - Majors Green was cut off in floods in May 2019 - No detail replacement of sports pitches - Site is further than 1.7km away fro
Q12	Iain McDowall [5320]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Incongruous effect of housing and an urban style sports centre in this area - More appropriate sites on lower grade Green Belt - Increase in traffic - Adverse impact on local ecology including needing a protective buffer to ancient woodland - Advers
Q12	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	<p>This site proposes the redevelopment of the existing sports pitches associated with Highgate Football Club and the Old Yardleians Rugby Club. The current land use also contains a Local Wildlife Site and designated Ancient Woodland as well as historic hedgerows.</p> <p>As such, the Council should ensure their assessments are fair, robust and objective and the site is sequentially acceptable when weighed against others. It is also noted that 'future work is required in connect with replacement of all of the displaced pitches.'</p>
Q12	J D Green [3195]		<p>Site needs to be removed or reduced considerably to avoid over development of Green Belt land in the Blythe Area, flooding, unacceptable impacts on infrastructure and on amenity issues.</p> <p>With the large number of homes being built in the HS2 area, part of Blythe Valley Business Park being used for housing, together with 2,600 plus homes built in the A34 corridor over the past two years, there is no need for such large scale destruction of Green Belt land in the area.</p>
Q12	Jane & Alan Horton [4443]		<p>We strongly object to this draft plan on infrastructure issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The roadways feeding these new homes are not capable of supporting any further traffic. Many accidents have already occurred on Haslucks Green Road. due to the severe bends, adverse camber and narrowness of the road. 2. The lack off primary and secondary school places. 3. The lack of doctors and dentists. 4. Further traffic noise and pollution to the environment. 5 Loss of sporting facilities for children and young iadults 6. Difficulty parking for train passengers at Whitlocks End causing friction when parking in residential roads.around the station.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Jean Hobbs [2983]		Housing is essential we know but the influx of more cars and with building, more lorries to our narrow country lanes, just adds to the congestion that is here already. Whitlocks End station carpark is already full, and the narrow roads and very narrow footpaths, make it difficult to walk safely in the area. Surely before any more planning is given, infrastructure should be at the top of the agenda, or will it take more accidents before this is taken into consideration.
Q12	Jo Hayes [3874]		There are major issues with this proposal regarding traffic volumes, impact of highway improvements on hedgerows, inadequate public transport, lack of accessibility to village centre by walking, lack of facilities for children/young people, major loss of sports facilities, increased pressure on local services, impact on flora & fauna, lack of affordability of housing and exacerbating risks of flooding. The proposal does not address these issues in any meaningful way
Q12	Joelle Hill [4425]		I believe that this site will be detrimental to the area. Dickens Heath is already over developed from the original concept. The land identified currently is a buffer between various different settlements and should remain that way. I would think that a reduction in the current sporting facilities is not a good thing and the proposed alternatives inadequate to meet the community's needs. Not very accessible to shops and amenities and other than trains to Birmingham not currently served well by transport to the wider locale such as Solihull.
Q12	John Dimock [5669]		Lower grade green belt sites in Solihull area are in a more sustainable location. Also flooding has recently been severe problem in this clay area & this development will clearly make it worse in wet weather. This will increase demands on already over crowded parking facilities in town centre & rail station Loss of sports grounds & recreation areas for 9 clubs which is contrary to Government policy Demand for places at already oversubscribed Dickens Heath School
Q12	K J Hastie [6297]		Site 4 West of Dickens Heath Both the proposed developments in these areas will fundamentally alter the nature of majors green by increasing the traffic Volume far beyond the infrastructure can cope with. It is already far too great at present. The erosion of the green belt area is completely unacceptable and should not be allowed. these developments alter the area and change the environment that residents have enjoyed for years we did not chose to live in a built up area and should not have this visited upon us I object strongly to what is proposed

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mark Reohorn [4378]		<p>350 houses is still too many for the area</p> <p>The area has very high car ownership, and development would mean another 700 cars on the road at rush hour, as well as with the developments already going ahead</p> <p>The Green belt will be impacted negatively</p> <p>Impact on existing households and character of the area - ancient woodlands and important Tithe Barn ancient woodland</p> <p>Impact on existing ecology - e.g. badger sets, bats and great crested newts</p>
Q12	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Would result in coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlocks End and Majors Green. Site is highly visually sensitive in landscape terms. Development would be an ill-thought out addition to the west of Dickens Heath and have no relationship to the original concept or masterplan. Masterplan makes no reference to how the site would complement or enhance Dickens Heath and it is acknowledged that further work is needed to identify links to the Village Centre.</p> <p>Site 4 has been dismissed as an allocation numerous times.</p> <p>No identified sites for the relocation of Sports pitches.</p> <p>No evidence of highway impact of the development.</p>
Q12	Miss Leigh Cole [5220]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The draft plans are removing resources that are part of the look and feel of the existing village - plans will impact on already awful infrastructure. - The road system is gridlocked every day in peak hours. - The idea that residents in new housin
Q12	Miss Janna Hobbs [5197]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The green belt should not be comprised as it is there to prevent urban sprawl - Existing infrastructure and parking in the area cannot cope, and the proposals do not adequately address a solution to this issue. - Moving sports fields further away from
Q12	Mr & Mrs Abbotts [4492]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Roads in and around Majors Green and Whitlocks End are extremely busy and were and still are only country lanes. - Since Dickens Heath was built the increase in the traffic using these narrow roads is already making it dangerous to cross any of the roads and trying to cross to Whitlocks End Station is extremely dangerous. - Building even more houses in this area is going to make traffic on these roads impossible while also destroying even more green belt land.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mr & Mrs Evans [4491]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am a resident of Majors Green, my house is on Haslucks Green Road. The traffic has increased to an all time high; development of this site would be unbearable. - Majors Green is a small community, classed as semi-rural but not for much longer it seems. Haslucks Green Road is a race track, and to add more traffic would be ridiculous. at peak times it can take up to 10 minutes to get off my drive which I think you will agree is quite annoying.
Q12	Mr Adam Hunter [3332]		<p>Adverse impacts of developing Site 4 significantly outweigh benefits of proximity to station, there are other sites in Solihull of lower grade Green Belt with lesser impacts and in more sustainable locations.</p> <p>Significant loss of sports fields, contrary to Government policy. Number of pitches would reduce from nine to two.</p> <p>Loss of character/accessibility which makes Dickens Heath Village attractive and beyond natural boundaries. Significant adverse impact on ecology, with four Local Wildlife sites, affecting ecological connectivity. Will exacerbate existing flooding problems. Impact on the high sensitivity landscape character. Ancient woodland/hedgerows restricts development.</p> <p>Local school already oversubscribed/no room for expansion.</p>
Q12	Mr Andrew Hughes [5493]		<p>Adverse effect on area and existing residents</p> <p>Negative impact on high performing Green Belt</p> <p>Traffic congestion will worsen (already intolerable)</p> <p>Loss of existing sports facilities without adequate provision of new facilities, also contrary to Government Policy</p> <p>Loss of Village character and decomposition of original concept</p> <p>Negative impact on landscape</p> <p>Destruction of Ancient Woodland & negative effect on Wildlife</p> <p>Further potential for flooding when already a known problem</p> <p>90% objection from existing DH residents</p> <p>DH school already oversubscribed.</p> <p>DH has already had more than it's fair share of development during the last Local</p>
Q12	Mr Charles Dempsey [5745]		<p>I have concerns regarding this site as I am resident in Majors Green and this will increase traffic through our village. The recent housing built at Tidbury Green and Solihull Lodge has already had a huge effect resulting in long queues of vehicles on Haslucks Green and Peterbrook Road. My son in law took 40 minutes to get out of Whitlocks End station, it has taken visitors to our property 15 minutes to get off our drive. This is a village with roads that are essentially country lanes. The air quality has become poor. Traffic needs to be redirected.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mr D Tabb [4499]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient infrastructure (roads, schools and health services) to cope with growth, - High volume of traffic - Already lots of new development in Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green
Q12	Mr Darryl Chinn [5708]		<p>I accept the need for new housing and do appreciate the reduction in massing but I am seriously concerned at the lack of infrastructure this increase of 600 plus car usage requires. There are regular accidents at Tilehouse Lane junction Stratford canal bridge and the bend close to Bills Lane junction. This will only increase with the increase in traffic usage particularly at rush hours. Lorries and coaches have to slow, sometimes stop to pass on this road. In addition there will be increases in noise and air pollution and pedestrian safety will be reduced with this proposed development.</p>
Q12	Mr David Neal [5868]		<p>This area provides as you say a check on the unrestricted sprawl yet you are choosing to build on it. You are also removing much needed sports facilities. Where will these be sited? you have not commented on any extra parking spaces which will be required as you try to get hundreds of new households to use the train service to Stratford or Birmingham. This will equate to hundreds of new commuters all trying to use the already gridlocked roads. You expect many will walk or cycle to their destinations. They will not as it will be too dangerous.</p>
Q12	Mr Edward Tan [5258]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site 4 is not a sustainable location - Would create substantial vehicular traffic. - Proposals for sports facility would not adequately replace the many sports clubs' requirements. - Traffic congestion is a major issue. - Lived on Tythe Barn Lane
Q12	Mr Eric Homer [3721]		<p>Despite reduction from 700 dwellings to 350, still unacceptable due to loss of playing fields, inadequate unresolvable road infrastructure, loss of high performing Green Belt land contrary to Government Policy, whilst other sites have lower performing Green Belt with less adverse impacts.</p> <p>Increased demand on rail services, poor links to Dickens Heath by road, cycleway or footpath and unsustainable as outside the 800m circle from the village centre.</p> <p>Adverse impact on the ecology of the area, flooding in area, reduction of gaps between village and other settlements. No justification for changing the green belt boundary to allow for new houses.</p>
Q12	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		<p>The extra housing will increase traffic and pollution. Bills Lane is narrow and too busy now.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mr Gary Seeney [6042]		<p>Roads too narrow throughout Dickens Heath. Already queuing traffic through Dickens Heath every morning Haslucks Green Rd, Tilehouse Lane, Tythe Barn Lane - narrow with many dangerous bends. Loss of amenity space - well used football pitches Loss of the unique Akamba garden centre, coffee shop, venue. Dickens Heath village centre - not able to cope with current traffic or parking</p>
Q12	Mr George Sutton [5876]		<p>The Tythe Barn Lane / Tilehouse Lane junction already experiences congestion in the AM and PM peak hours. Similarly, the main junction out of Dickens Heath is crippled during the AM peak and would be overwhelmed with any additional development scenario.</p> <p>In close proximity to the allocation site is Tyburn Coppice Ancient Woodland. Any development on the site of the rugby pitch would potentially result in an adverse impacts to ancient woodland, which is irreplaceable habitat and affords great protection through the NPPF.</p> <p>Without strategic highways improvements to junctions named above, I do not</p>
Q12	Mr Gordon Walters [5512]		<p>Infrastructure of Dickens Heath has not been improved to accommodate existing additional development. Site has no direct physical connection to Dickens Heath and proximity to railway station is not enough to justify development. Road improvements will be difficult to undertake given characteristics of the road. Local wildlife issues and loss of playing fields with no alternatives proposed. No other proposed site has such adverse effects if developed. It should be removed as an allocation. Retain the field between Akamba, Tythe Barn Lane and the Stratford Canal for up to 100 dwellings as a sustainable extension of Dickens Heath.</p>
Q12	Mr Hugh Swindell [5209]		<p>Whilst I acknowledge the need for additional housing unless the surrounding infrastructure is improved at the same pace problems will inevitably arise. This development will drive further additional traffic through and already busy area including but not limited to neighboring major's green.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mr Ivan Armstrong [5831]		<p>The access to the station from Rosebriars is one of the most dangerous roads in the area without any safe crossings or adequate footpaths. As a frequent user I have to use the car for a 300Mt journey. Walking or cycling is unsafe. The proposal to make Tythe Barn lane a safe route is no use to Majors green residents.</p> <p>The railway bridge road is far too narrow for the traffic and pedestrians with many very near misses from bus & Lorry wing mirrors.</p> <p>The whole area infrastructure requires an independent safety consultants review.</p>
Q12	Mr John Bragg [5578]		<p>I object because infrastructure plans to cope with significantly increased traffic hav'nt been declared. Majors Green (Bromsgrove district) borders Solihull at the very dangerous bend and junction between Haslucks Green road and Tilehouse Lane, near Whitlocks end Station. I live in Rosebriars, a cul-de-sac which is very close to the dangerous bend. There have been many accidents and on 2 recent occasions, cars have left the road, ending up in my neighbours rear garden, which backs onto the bend. What are you going to do? Housing developments are fine, but please take responsibility for significantly increasing danger in Majors Green.</p>
Q12	Mr Keith Oneill [5194]		<p>Objection to Site 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing volume of increased traffic is impacting on the immediate and surrounding areas - Roads were designed as country lanes and not for the constant use of residential and through traffic flow. - The loss of local sports grounds and no plans for adequate replacements. - Impact on Whitlocks end station and the increased requirement of parking spaces. - Lack of proposed new amenities such as Doctors/ shops/schools etc.
Q12	Mr Mark Briers [5821]		<p>There is not the infrastructure to support this, particularly the road system. Already small roads often with traffic control that are extremely busy. Getting on to the M42 at peak times already very, very slow.</p> <p>"Highway improvements" are undefined and I feel only new highways will help. To suggest that bike lanes are going to solve any congestion is ridiculous given our climate. Dickens Heath has limited facilities so for supermarkets people will have to drive</p>
Q12	Mr Mark Bruckshaw [3743]		<p>There is not enough investment in sufficient infrastructure to cope with the increase in traffic in this area.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mr Marshall Moses [3348]		Experiencing other drivers anger and horn sounding when I slowdown to enter the drive to my home on Haslucks Green road. How will an increase of housing (plot 4) without any change to infrastructure, particularly road/public transport impact on the point made above? with the increased volume of traffic on Haslucks Green road at Whitlocks End station; pedestrian access is now inadequate and dangerous - poor footpaths - very difficult to cross Haslucks Green road/Tilehouse Lane. More homes provided at plot 4 will impact the greenbelt buffer between SMBC and BDC not to mention school/GP's.
Q12	Mr Martin Nash [5626]		I live in Major's Green and the infrastructure around is at bursting point. We cannot take on extra vehicles without an obverse effect on the country roads. There needs to be an alternative road(s) put in place to take the traffic away, many use the roads at great speed as Rat Runs.
Q12	Mr Matthew Lewis [5332]		- The addition of 350 houses would impact infrastructure in the area, school places and travel will not be able to sustain the amount of houses proposed. - Loss of more Green Belt land is against government policy - No improvement measures to infrastru
Q12	Mr Matthew Workman [2947]		The area simply cannot cope with more houses. road infrastructure is diabolical and the local station cannot cope with the number of people looking to park there. Dickens Heath has far outgrown it original ideals that were sold to residents. Parking is atrocious, properties are flooded on a more regular basis due to inconsiderate buildings, plus the lack of police resources means crime is on the rise. How about build some amenities rather constantly building inappropriate housing.. The government wants houses for first time buyers, but all you see built is 4/5/6 bedroom houses as they sell for more money.
Q12	Mr Michael Hunter [3086]		I wish to object to the inclusion of Site 4 for development
Q12	Mr Michael Unsworth [5976]		This site would cause many problems with both the lack of infrastructure, from the lack of public transport to the very narrow roads which are still country lanes which currently have major traffic jams during the main rush hour traffic times, and both Dickens Heath and Majors Green would be gridlocked causing great pain to the local residents. The train station at Whitlocks End is already full everyday and could not cope with anymore cars as they are already starting to use the back streets to park their cars causing issues for the residents living close to the station.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mr N Plotnek [5997]		Supports inclusion of site 4 as an allocated site considers land adjacent at 237 Tythe Barn Lane positively contributes to this allocation. The boundaries of the LWS to the east is incorrectly marked and therefore the Ancient woodland has been misrepresented. Land at Tythe Barn Lane, to north east of allocation is mostly previously developed and could accommodate 10 to 12 dwellings on site. It is separate in character and appearance and does not form part of or contribute to the adjacent woodland or LWS. Site is more suitable than site 405 which has been positively tested against the Council's evidence base. It benefits from high accessibility to Whitlock End train station and an existing car access point serves the land preventing the need to remove any hedgerow. Owner committed to delivery within first five years and is in ownership of park of adjacent woodland therefore would consider compensatory measures to enhance the woodland. Highlights concerns over deliverability of housing in other parcels in site 4
Q12	Mr N Walters [2802]		There is no justification for expanded Dickens Heath anymore!!! It was conceived as a village and should remain so! Site 4 has recreational uses that should be maintained, the site owners are just capitalizing on land grabbing with no thought about creating a sustainable community. SMBC are supporting as it is the easy option and completely disregard public/local councillors opinions. Minor tinkering of the road network will not alleviate peak hour traffic jams or help the declining air pollution caused by so many cars standing in stationary traffic.
Q12	Mr Paul Doyle [5244]		- No faith in plans given past and present experiences. - Latter stages of development in the village have had little regard to local road network - Have little confidence in the ability of the authority to manage any future development and increase in
Q12	Mr Paul Guggiari [5936]		Reference is made to replacing the sports pitches, I assume this includes the club houses etc. and not just pitches.I see no plans for this and where they will be? Reference is also made to maintaining hedgerows etc. which is good but this could compromise the road improvements required to cater with the influx of population, so have the road improvements been evaluated properly?

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mr Peter Sutton [5735]		<p>The attached plan shows the new road connecting Whitlocks End Station with the A34 and providing access to Dickens Heath and Site 12.</p> <p>A new traffic island would be located to replace the sharp bend on Haslucks Green Road at the junction with Peterbrook Road. The new road would cross both the railway line and canal nearby and would not affect any of the proposed housing.</p>
Q12	Mr Rajul Pankhania [5755]		<p>Traffic volumes are high already and with proposed development will cause more risk to unsafe roads as they currently stand. Current roads are not appropriate for current levels of traffic and pedestrians are already at risk. Recent development of Whitlocks End Train station car park have caused an increase in traffic volumes. I have already observed students being hit by car wing mirrors as they walk along the roads.</p> <p>This area is at high risk of flooding as per previous high precipitation observed. What is the plan to allow for this and to ensure that the water is managed correctly.</p>
Q12	Mr Richard Deane [5510]		<p>The current plans do not reflect the need to keep the separation from existing settlements adding significantly to busy roads schools etc. The infrastructure plans are not sufficient to meet overall plan requirements. The focus for this development is sacrificing too many leisure facilities, natural habitat and historic landscapes. Too much development has already taken place in Blythe, disproportionately compared to other locations in Solihull.</p>
Q12	Mr Roger Grainger [5515]		<p>Loss of sports grounds/recreation areas for 9 clubs which is contrary to Government Policy</p>
Q12	Mr Roger Grainger [5515]		<p>More suitable sites available which are lower performing Green Belt, have less of an adverse impact and are in more sustainable locations.</p> <p>Loss of high performing Green Belt and coalescence issues.</p> <p>Increased traffic and congestion and lack of parking at station and village centre.</p> <p>Loss of sports ground.</p> <p>Loss of original concept of Dickens Heath village.</p> <p>Significant impact on ecology - the site has 4 LWSs</p> <p>Flooding issues.</p> <p>Significant local objection to the site.</p> <p>Akamba Garden Centre should be retained.</p> <p>Local School is oversubscribed.</p> <p>Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green have already had their fair share of development over recent years.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mr Roger Grainger [5515]		The development would have a significant adverse impact on the ecology of the area, which has 4 Local Wildlife Sites.
Q12	Mr Roger Hansbury [5594]		The Road infrastructure to the east and west of this development, which would be the exits and entrants to this development are both at full capacity. With standing traffic on both exits/entrant at rush hour periods. The bridge at Whitlocks End Train Station is too narrow to take current volumes of traffic and the poor footpath to the station from Majors Green is dangerous to use at this present moment. It has to be considered that these roads will not only be taking traffic from this development but also from all the other planned developments in the area.
Q12	Mr Roy Walters [5837]		Haslucks Green Rd in the past 10 years has the traffic of "A" rd rather than a minor country rd . In the 200 yd section between Drawbridge to Tythe Barn at least 20 plus repairs to water pipes and collapsed drains in past 2 years. Infrastructure of this rd completely unsuitable for increased traffic. Whitlocks end train station increased parking 5 years ago and already at capacity resulting in more parking in local side roads. Takes me 10 to 15 minutes at peak times just to get off my driveway safely. Exhaust pollution at peak times health hazard already.
Q12	Mr Stanley Cairns [5978]		I recognise that SMBC need to build more houses but I object strongly to the number of house being built on the Bromsgrove District boundary in particular those either side of Majors Green which is already has overcrowded roads. I am however pleased that you have decided not to build the large sports stadium. My main concern is the infrastructure hence there is a requirement to undertake a study with the view of moving the traffic away from Majors Green area. This area is already known as an accident black spot hence additional traffic will increase this risk
Q12	Mr Trevor Mophew [5497]		As a Dickens Heath resident for over 20 years we have suffered significant development on our doorstep already. This proposal is now a step too far. We have taken our fair share of new home development in the Solihull area and the impact on local residents, traffic, school children, wildlife and the elderly is now disproportionate to the value any further development might represent. In addition, opening up Birchy Close (a private road for decades) to grant public access is totally unacceptable. Please re-consider and abandon this plan.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mr Tristram Oliver [5218]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to Site 4 - Provision for the three sports clubs won't be adequate, losing a large part of the community. - There are currently at least ten pitches and the new plans would only give back two. - Clubs will have to disband as they just won't
Q12	Mr Vincent Essex [5421]		<p>Having reviewed all the sites, I feel site 4 is the best one to be included and developed. I live adjacent to site 4 and do not have objections it being developed. My only concern is that Birchy Leasowes Lane is unsuitable for any access to site 4. This has to be along Tilehouse or Thythe Barn Lane as it looks to be. It is the closest to the station and walking distance to Dickens Heath...it makes natural extension to the current Dickens Heath development.</p>
Q12	Mr William Wright [5900]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -38% housing in solihull built in Shirley -4000 new cars -stations full to overflowing -pollution -flooding -Stratford Road full all day -Bills Lane Haslucks Green Road at capacity
Q12	Mr. Laurence Hackworth [5806]		<p>Swopping sports centres for housing, there are far better sites with lower grade green belt which could be used instead. Coalescence with Whitlocks End, Majors Green, Bromsgrove District Council, which also means we lose the character of DH village. Thought it had to be within 80metres or 10mins walking distance to facilities of DH - this is not. Impact on landscape, ancient woodlands and wildlife sites will be ruined, buffers required to protect these, and connectivity would be huge. Survey of DH residents 90% objected to further development. Loss of wildlife/greenbelt in area being consumed by housing</p>
Q12	Mrs Helen Houghton [3239]		<p>As a resident on Haslucks Green Road in Majors Green, I have to object about the potential increase in traffic which will be forced to go through our village due to extra housing on Site 4. The already congested "Country Road" creates havoc getting off our driveway. Haslucks Green Road has become a "City Road", unsafe to walk through, noisy and polluted. Infrastructure desperately needs looking at. Thank you.</p>
Q12	Mrs Kashka Mandeville-Lewis [5331]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The addition of 350 houses would impact infrastructure in the area, school places and travel will not be able to sustain the amount of houses proposed. - Loss of more Green Belt land is against government policy - No improvement measures to infrastru

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mrs Shobhna Patel [6130]		<p>I am a resident of 10 Rosebriars. It is unacceptable to build so many homes on our doorstep. Infrastructure of the the roads and other public facilities is poor and does not support the constant increase in traffic. Heavy goods vehicle use these narrow roads which inhibits passage of cars. Roads in the surrounding areas are already overused.</p> <p>Our house is at an accident prone black spot and have already had cars ram into our fence and thus increasing our insurance cost. we already do not feel safe. this will increase carbon foot print and subject residence with toxic fumes.</p>
Q12	Mrs Victoria Moses [5648]		<p>Concerned about the impact of additional traffic on the safety of pedestrians due to the dangerous narrow pavements from Haslucks Green Road to Whitlocks End Station . Due to the increased volume of traffic it is very difficult to cross the road safely at Tilehouse Lane / Haslucks Green Road .</p> <p>Increased risk of flooding inMajors Green due to the development of additional housing the canal flooded over into gardens last year.</p> <p>Reduction in the green belt with the development of more homes at plot 4 will reduce the green belt buffer between Bromsgrove and Solihull</p> <p>nMajors Green</p>
Q12	Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]		<p>this conflicts with the urban form of Dickens Heath on an unsuitable location, generating additional traffic on already congested roads. The loss of sports grounds with no sites being put forward,</p>
Q12	Mrs Andrea Wood [5321]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Increased pressure on our roads and traffic * Poor broadband and mobile phone service * Fatal accident waiting to happen outside our schools with increase in traffic and pupils * Losing open spaces and local community facilities * This will lose the village feel * House prices will drop * Increased crime/struggle on police

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mrs Brenda Clayson [5668]		Will destroy the good balance between housing and open space. The whole environment will become a concrete housing estate and car park. Traffic congestion is already problematic and this will worsen resulting in health problems. The pollution, disruption, reduction in public open space and the effect on the environment and people's quality of life will be immense. This conflicts with the Plan's health and supporting local communities policies. The infrastructure, including local services like schools, libraries and health facilities are already overloaded and will not cope with additional development. The area is prone to flooding.
Q12	Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]		Objection to Site 4: - This development will essentially join Dickens Heath to Shirley. - Again roads and schools will have added pressure, not to mention loss of many sports clubs.
Q12	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		Taking away existing playing field facilities, which also helps to create a boundary and green space between developments, does not make sense. Promoting sport/fitness for young people and old does not appear to be on the agenda for residents and their families. Drastic changes would be needed for the train network from Whitlocks End to Birmingham as the facility is overstretched now and over capacity. Cars entering and leaving the existing large car park at Whitlocks End is causing hazardous congestion now. Additional residents would end up parking on nearby streets causing more congestion.
Q12	Mrs Denise Hackworth [2903]		* Other sites in the area which would have a lesser impact and are of lower grade green belt in a more sustainable location. * Additional people/cars would exacerbate existing traffic jam/pollution in an already congested area. *Loss of 9 sports grounds/facilities which is contrary to government policy. *Site not close to Dickens Heath facilities would encourage more traffic coming into village for its services, with no available carparking. *Site would have a direct impact on Ancient Woodlands, 4 wildlife areas affecting the routes that the wildlife take. * 90% of DH residents objected to this development in a survey.
Q12	Mrs Diane Thornton [3107]		Not within 10 minute walk to shops as per original Dickens Heath design concept. Site 4 states that improvements will be made to the infrastructure. However, roads cannot be improved as there are ancient hedgerows. The council appears not to have done its homework.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mrs Elizabeth Last [5368]		<p>Objection to proposal of 350 homes at Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of Green Belt and coalescence between Dickens Heath and villages in Bromsgrove - Increased traffic will exacerbate existing congestion - Extra demands on overcrowded rail services and inadequate parking - Loss of sports ground - Adverse impact on ancient woodland and ecology - Loss of attractiveness to Dickens Heath - Negative impact on landscape character - Existing flooding issues made worse - Lots of local objection - Pressure on primary school places - <u>Area taken more than fair share of development in recent years</u>
Q12	Mrs Hazel Reed [3279]		<p>Dickens Heath has already reached its limits, further development would create urban sprawl. It should be noted that trains from Whitlocks End go to Birmingham/Stratford, the majority of residents would drive to school/work. Improvement would need to be made to already congested and dangerous surrounding roads of neighbouring authority. Development would damage the ecological balance of the area with loss of wildlife habitats and ancient hedgerows. Flooding, already a problem in the surrounding area would increase due to over development of land</p>
Q12	Mrs Helen Bolus [5216]		<p>We object to the proposal of building 350 homes on the grounds of the fact that the local infrastructure is not suitable to support additional houses. Key concerns are traffic congestion, previous flooding in this area, schooling and medical services.</p>
Q12	Mrs Jayne Bott [5774]		<p>Main objection: the infrastructure around this site is already at breaking point .Haslucks Green Road is already over loaded with cars and there are numerous accidents by Whitlocks End Station where Haslucks Green Road meets Tilehouse Lane. There is often a queue of traffic along Haslucks Green Road before the bend by Whitlocks End Station, you have to take your life in your hands if you are walking in any direction from the train station. Trying to be seen by a local doctor is also very difficult, this will also get harder, particular a problem for the elderly and unwell.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		<p>Number of significant adverse effects to developing Site 4. Only reason for selection of site is proximity to Whitlocks End Station. Dickens Heath village has increased from original design of 850 dwellings to approx. 1800 today. Roads and infrastructure have not been improved to accommodate vast increase in dwellings. Difficult to make road improvements due to narrow rural roads, hedgerows and parking problems in village centre. Protected species on site. Land is heavy boulder clay and liable to flooding. Loss of village character and identity. Landscape sensitive to development. Loss of playing fields with no alternative proposals submitted. Would support inclusion of SHELAA Site 130 only. Agree Akamba site should be retained. Significant objection by local residents. Disproportionate scale of development in Blythe ward. Loss of Green Belt, which Government has committed to protecting. Lower performing Green Belt should be chosen instead. Site would not be accessible location to Dickens heath village services. Loss of wildlife habitat of high ecological value.</p>
Q12	Mrs Julia Abell [5604]		<p>The infrastructure is not in place to facilitate this development our small roads can not cope with the existing traffic let alone adding to it. It will also be putting the local residents at risk of higher house insurance premiums due to the flood risk threat increasing</p>
Q12	Mrs Julia finnegan [5742]		<p>Increase in traffic in an area that has already seen this following expansion of Dickens Heath. Whitlock's end station is on a dangerous stretch of road near a bridge and is already full to capacity in terms of parking most days of the week</p>
Q12	Mrs Karen Masterton [6102]		<p>In 2018 the canal flooded as far as the drawbridge actually flooding some houses however the field referred to in this proposal provide a very important flood plain which definitely reduced the impact on houses further up the canal. If built on any flood water would inundate all the houses along the canal. Traffic is the other issue all roads mentioned in this proposal are narrow country lanes, certainly Tythe Barn Lane is already congested at peak times. Most traffic will turn onto Tile House Lane and onto Haslucks Green Road which are already busy and congested at peak times.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]		Wellbeing and open space for existing residents. Protecting wildlife. Large traffic increase making it even more unsafe for Majors Green residents. No safe place to cross, narrow footpaths, sharp bends so lack of vision. Increasing difficulty in cars exiting Rushleigh Road/Cambria Close. Planned cycle and pedestrian paths unlikely to be used as too dangerous and people in general would rather drive. Junction of Haslucks Green/Tilehouse is busy at peak times and is dangerous (numerous accidents). Whitlocks End station and canal bridges unlikely to cope with traffic. Flooding in Tythebarn Lane. Train service already inadequate at peak times.
Q12	Mrs Katie Pile [5502]		The roads and parking at stations are already insufficient for the number of people living here. It will become unbearable if more houses are built. We are a village. We do not want to use all of our beautiful countryside to build on and create more problems.
Q12	Mrs Linda Homer [3729]		Despite reduction from 700 dwellings to 350, still unacceptable due to loss of playing fields, inadequate unresolvable road infrastructure, loss of high performing Green Belt land contrary to Government Policy, whilst other sites have lower performing Green Belt with less adverse impacts. Increased demand on rail services, poor links to Dickens Heath by road, cycleway or footpath and unsustainable as outside the 800m circle from the village centre. Adverse impact on the ecology of the area, flooding in area, reduction of gaps between village and other settlements. No justification for changing the green belt boundary to allow for new houses.
Q12	Mrs Margaret Dempsey [5630]		Current level of traffic is extremely heavy, we can't get off the drive and cannot cross the roads at busy times. Since the building of new estates in Tidbury Green and Solihull Lodge traffic numbers have increased and the air quality has greatly reduced. The planned building levels are going to further impact on the quality of life in Majors Green. The roads are narrow and are little more than country lanes and cannot cope with the amount of traffic that is currently using them, Also I have concerns that there is no capacity at local schools or GP surgeries.
Q12	Mrs Nicola Brown [5219]		Increasing the size of Dickens Heath is not feasible, the original and infrastructure of the road system and layout would not cope with increased capacity or use. Neither would the village centre and parking.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]		This area has a lot of sports fields that are widely used by the local community, moving them will put even more traffic on the already congested roads. Dickens Heath was supposed to be a small new village, it now in danger of sprawling into existing settlements, Tidbury Green, Majors Green, Cheswick Green and Shirley, making this one large urban sprawl.
Q12	Mrs Pamela Farrar [5858]		The local roads cannot cope. Traffic is very problematic already near Whitlock's End station and particularly on the corner of Haslucks Green Road where cars repeatedly go off the road and through people's hedges and walls. The loss of sports facilities does not support healthy lifestyles or reduction to childhood obesity
Q12	mrs Pamela Reda [5724]		Loss of sports ground / recreation areas for 9 clubs which is contrary to Govt. policy Demands on already crowded local rail services & inadequate parking at the station & village centre Liable to flooding already - this area when developed will deteriorate surrounding areas particularly in Dickens Heath Demand for places at Dickens Heath school which is oversubscribed already. 90% of respondents to the last Dickens Heath Parish Council survey objected to site 4 Dickens Heath & Tidbury Green have already taken their fair share of development during the last Local Plan allocations
Q12	Mrs Philomena Beach [5880]		- Increased traffic this will cause in an already busy area. - The pavements around Whitlocks Station are not safe for pedestrians to walk to the station nor would it be safe to cycle to on such busy roads. The station already can't cope with the amount
Q12	Mrs Sally Cridland [5819]		I am so concerned of the number of new houses that are being planned for building in the near future. I have resided at 510 Haslucks Green Road for almost 40 years and during that time the road has become more like a race track and find it very difficult to enter or leave my drive with the amount fast traffic, if the proposed houses that are being considered built where is traffic that will also arise as the road cannot cope with what has grown over the last number of years The speed on the road is dangerous

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		<p>1. The area has already taken substantial development in recent years and cannot accommodate the scale of this proposal.</p> <p>2. No new employment is proposed in the area resulting in residents having to drive to work causing commuter chaos.</p> <p>3. Inadequate infrastructure in area.</p> <p>4. Loss of sports grounds and recreation contrary to government policy: Most of the playing fields (sports clubs) west of DH are still under threat, including the extensive Old Yardleins RFC. Only Shirley Town FC opposite Whitlock's End station and the small football field just east of it are retained. The 'sports hub' that was in Richborough Estates proposal on the land north of Tythe Barn Lane, of 2016, is not proposed. It is not clear where the playing fields are to go to.</p> <p>5. Impact on a high performing area of Green Belt contrary to government policy</p> <p>6. Coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlock End, Majors Green and Bromsgrove District.</p> <p>5. Impact on landscape character.</p> <p>6. Detrimental to the initial award winning design and concept of Dickens Heath. Location is unsustainable as not easily linked to village centre.</p>
Q12	Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]		<p>All the roads that lead in and out of Dickens Heath are small narrow lanes with ancient hedge rows, traffic and parking in this area are already a major concern to local residents. Putting large amounts of more new homes will result in grid lock. This area has large amounts of well used sports grounds moving them will cause even more traffic. This site is now sprawling into Majors Green and Tidbury green.</p>
Q12	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of community facilities. - Loss of wildlife. - Infrastructure not able to cope (no new roads or additional parking at Whitlocks End). - Flooding risk. - This area already totally overdeveloped. - Air quality concerns.
Q12	Mrs Susan Doley [5824]		<p>I do not agree that site 4 should be included as allocated site due to the lack of infrastructure at present.</p> <p>There has been a substantial increase in new homes in Dickens Heath, Wythall and Tidbury Green in recent years. Traffic on Tilehouse Lane and Haslucks Green Road has increased tremendously, the junction of these two being extremely difficult and dangerous to negotiate by car or on foot particularly at peak times. Congestion on these roads and the parking at Whitlock End station is at saturation point so cars are being parked on both sides of Fords Road causing obstructions.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Mrs Sylvia Gardiner [5398]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant impact on the wildlife and ecology of the area - - Agree with Para. 141 regarding Green Belt Enhancements, particularly the allocation (previously Site 13) of a country park on the land at south Shirley. - Should respect objectives in p.20 of DLP 2016. "Ensure quality design and development which integrates with its surroundings and creates...attractiveness and to people's quality of life". - Refer to Prime Minister's statement January 2018 Environment Policy "We hold our natural environment in trust for the next generation...natural environment protected and enhanced for the future."
Q12	Mrs Wendy Murphy [5694]		<p>Building homes on this green space site will create more traffic problems for the area. Bills Lane regularly has traffic jams during the morning rush hour and at times during the day it is difficult trying to cross the road on foot.</p>
Q12	Mrs. Susan Hunter [5811]		<p>Area taken a disproportionately high share of recent housing development. Adverse impacts outweigh the benefits of providing houses near a railway station. High performing Green Belt would be lost. Coalescence between Solihull and Bromsgrove. Loss of sports pitches. Additional traffic congestion, pollution and impact on health. Parking at Whitlocks End Station is inadequate. Loss of local character and original principles of Dickens Heath. Site is detached from the village. Resistance to proposed footpath onto Birchy Close. Impact on ecology and loss of wildlife habitat. Poor drainage and flooding occurrences would increase. Impact on the landscape character and ancient woodland. School already oversubscribed. Development would breach an defensible Green Belt boundary and not create one.</p>
Q12	Mrs. Susan Hunter [5811]		<p>I wish to object to the development of Site 4 west of Dickens Heath</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adding to the unchecked 'sprawl' of Dickens Heath
Q12	Ms Denise Davies [5392]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure cannot cope - New developments of last 18 months have very little green garden or border areas - Will cause traffic chaos and add unbearable burden on traffic in already congested are

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Ms Jo Fuller [5381]		Object to the loss of sporting facilities will impact the wellbeing of residents New residents will impact overstretched roads around site 4 New residents will impact future potential flooding (this area floods regularly) Negative impact on bird/wildlife
Q12	Ms Lizzy Flower [5874]		Strongly object to proposed site 4. There would be congestion, traffic and noise pollution.
Q12	Ms Nicole Geoghegan [5643]		The entire road system in and around Dickens Heath is now insufficient and dangerous - even with the existing population. A small number of leasees are responsible for the maintenance, renewal, operational expenses, etc of a number of communal sites/facilities in Dickens Heath. The legal structure put in place some 10+years ago relating to these Common Assets is not tenable with further development around Dickens Heath. Buildings in Dickens Heath subject to recent flooding, contributed to by the lack of balancing ponds in/around the village. Further development of current farmland/undeveloped land around Dickens Heath can only exacerbate flooding risk.
Q12	Nick Tickner [5514]		There are some positives, but the current traffic load on the roads is becoming a problem, and this will make it much worse. Public transport links are already poor, and either not used (the bus link) or overcrowded (the train to Bhm). Too much building has taken place in Dickens Heath over the past 10 years. Expecting it to absorb another 350 houses as proposed (Site 4 West) is overburdening the already strained infrastructure. - give it a break and try somewhere else for a change
Q12	Paul J Dufrane [4410]		The council has asked for alternative sites, if being near a station is a requirement, have the fields to the east of Widney Manor Station been considered Dickens Heath which won best village was based on all houses being within a 10 minute walk to shops, this is something that no longer can be claimed . Site 4 states that improvements will be made to the infrastructure however roads cannot be improved as there are ancient hedgerows, which again the council appear to have neglected

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Paula Price [4498]		<p>Objection to Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Idyllic lifestyle and view of the countryside will be lost - Already lot of building development in Dickens Heath and Shirley Parkgate, bringing increased pollution and health implications - Three local football clubs will be affected - Knock-on effect on young people able to play sport and their health and wellbeing - Loss of parkland and recreation areas - Existing area overcrowded with high volume of traffic - Highway safety issues
Q12	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		<p>Site promoters of parcel CFS130 of Site 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site is available for development now, without the need to relocate existing uses or demolish existing buildings - Site capacity up to 150 dwellings. - Development would provide improved pedestrian linkages to Whitlock's End rail station - Existing field and hedgerow boundary can be retained - Can provide SUDS - Retention and improvement of existing green corridors - Opportunities to improve the local highway network - Opportunities to enhance the canal side setting - <u>Delivery of high quality housing and much needed affordable market and social</u>
Q12	Peter & Elaine King [3262]		<p>It is ludicrous to think of these sites and get rid of the football grounds and the wildlife habitats. Where on earth will the youngsters of today find places for recreation or do we just allow them to roam the streets with knives causing havoc.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Phil & Theresa Thurston [6211]		<p>The site boundary area is wholly negative in terms of a sustainability analysis Dickens Heath has grown massively, but road network has not been improved to accommodate increase in homes. Site has no direct physical connection to Dickens Heath. Due to parking problems the rural narrow roads and historic hedgerows will be difficult to make sufficient road improvements.</p> <p>Site is a high performing green belt site. There are more surrounding LWS than any other allocations</p> <p>Land is liable to flooding (deep boulder clay)</p> <p>Site is not within walking distance of village centre, there would be a loss of character and identity.</p> <p>Site is in an area of landscape sensitive to development. There would be a loss of playing fields with no alternative provision. No other proposed site in the Draft Local Plan has such adverse effects if developed and therefore Site 4 should be removed from the proposed allocation for development.</p>
Q12	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>Given the amount of detail that is provided, our main concern at this stage is with the loss of the playing fields and whether the allocation has reference to the recently published Solihull Playing Pitch Strategy (January 2019). Further evidence is required to establish whether the relocated provision is in a suitable location and deliverable. In the absence of this evidence, our Client's site would be more appropriate, particularly given it is adjacent to Dickens Heath Sports Club and could feasibly contribute to the identified shortfall in provision.</p>
Q12	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		<p>No, Dickens Heath has experienced considerable development until recently and cannot take much more development. More development is happening at Tidbury Green following recent Appeals. Just because there is a nearby railway station is not enough to justify further major development of Dickens Heath. Every other planning factor points to the unsuitability of Site 4 for development. The cumulative adverse effect of the range of evidence set out above make Site 4 contrary to a range of local and national planning policies. This Site should be demoted to a "red" site.</p>
Q12	Rita Whateley [5581]		<p>Having lived in Majors Green for 58 years since birth, I am most concerned about the major impact that these new builds will have on our 'Country Lanes' in and around Majors Green. They are already congested at peak periods due to developments at Tidbury Green and Dickens Heath. I have seen our roads come under more and more pressure by the increased volume of traffic over the years. We cannot cope with anymore. It will cause more noise and pollution also risk to pedestrian safety. You have a duty to protect our Green Belt and environment.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Robert Street [5747]		The road infrastructure is inadequate; as is the drainage and there is past history of flooding even to those newbuild house recently constructed on the corner of Cleobury Lane. Playing fields will be massively reduced to only 2 no. pitches which would be not enough to resource the current facilities. Many current houses are built on piled foundations which would impact on any newbuild costs. Wildlife will be affected such as small deer which numbers have reduced severely over recent years.
Q12	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	would result in coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlocks End and Majors Green. Site is highly visually sensitive in landscape terms. Development is an ill-thought out addition to the west of Dickens Heath and has no relationship to the original concept. No reference to how the site would complement or enhance Dickens Heath. No identified sites for the relocation of Sports pitches. No evidence of highway impact of the development. Ironic to note site 13 comments and the importance of maintaining a gap between any urban extension and Dickens Heath when the impact of site 4 would be incalculably more detrimental
Q12	Sheetal Sharma [6257]		the proposed site is one of only two entry and exit roads to Dickens Heath and has restricted access due to narrowing for on coming traffic . Tythe Barn Lane is laden with traffic due to people using it as a main artery through to Whitlocks End station where many park and ride to Birmingham and onto Shirley and Birmingham by road. Roads are prone to flooding and become impassable. Dickens Heath has already ensured significant development. Lack of parking provision in the village centre will be made worse. Loss of green space
Q12	Sheila Kelly [6294]		Please leave us some green land. All our green area has been depleted to such a great extent
Q12	Simon Taylor [4550]		- Fundamentally object to proposed sites 4, 12 and 26, due to the inequitable scale of development in this area versus other areas. - Furthermore, site 4 should not be included as it is a recognised Green Belt Area with a high rating to prevent urban sp
Q12	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		we support the reduction in housing numbers in site 4 and it being included as an allocated site subject to adequate environmental safeguards of natural environmental features and also subject to provision of replacement sports pitches within site 4. In respect of the draft concept master plan members indicated they would object to the inclusion of site 4 at later stages if provision was not made to accommodate Highgate United FC, Leafield FC and Old Yardleians Rugby Club within site 4.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		<p>Sport England consider that if the site is allocated a requirement for the allocation policy should state the playing fields (playing pitches and ancillary facilities) should not be developed upon until replacement provision is made in line with the requirements of NPPF paragraph 97(b) and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy.</p> <p>Site promoter masterplan would represent a quantitative loss of playing field land, therefore it would not comply with national planning policy and Sport England policies relating to playing fields.</p> <p>SMBC's illustrative emerging concept masterplan retention of Shirley Town FC does not represent replacement pitches.</p>
Q12	Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]		<p>Support. Site well-served by public transport including Whitlocks End station. Richborough Estates will continue to work with Council to bring forward allocation, and refine concept masterplan. Capacity of the proposed allocation is greater than suggested in consultation, realistically around 600-650 dwellings, if development makes effective and efficient use of land.</p> <p>Will also seek to agree relocation of sports facilities to an equivalent or better standard of provision for local sports clubs and the public. Should recognise need for clear strategy for enhancing sports provision to meet growth needs, and explore capacity within neighbouring allocations and at former Site 13.</p>
Q12	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Would result in coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlocks End and Majors Green. Site is highly visually sensitive in landscape terms. Development would be an ill-thought out addition to the west of Dickens Heath and have no relationship to the original concept or masterplan. Masterplan makes no reference to how the site would complement or enhance Dickens Heath and it is acknowledged that further work is needed to identify links to the Village Centre.</p> <p>Site 4 has been dismissed as an allocation numerous times.</p> <p>No identified sites for the relocation of Sports pitches.</p> <p>No evidence of highway impact of the development.</p>
Q12	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		<p>Stratford-on-Avon District Council is concerned that development at Dickens Heath (700 dws) could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]		Concern that development far too large which would cause serious local infrastructure problems and excessive pollution, when taken in conjunction with adjacent developments in Bromsgrove District. Consider reducing size of development so that it does not overload Blythe/Shirley South area, which is still bearing the brunt of excessive development of 41% while Knowle is 17% Dorridge & Hockley Heath is 7% Meriden 1% & Bickenhill 31%. Development should be spread more fairly across Borough
Q12	Terry Clayson [4147]		Will destroy the good balance between housing and open space. The whole environment will become a concrete housing estate and car park. Traffic congestion is already problematic and this will worsen resulting in health problems. The pollution, disruption, reduction in public open space and the effect on the environment and people's quality of life will be immense. This conflicts with the Plan's health and supporting local communities policies. The infrastructure, including local services like schools, libraries and health facilities are already overloaded and will not cope with additional development. The area is prone to flooding.
Q12	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Would result in coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlocks End and Majors Green. Site is highly visually sensitive in landscape terms. Development would be an ill-thought out addition to the west of Dickens Heath and have no relationship to the original concept or masterplan. Masterplan makes no reference to how the site would complement or enhance Dickens Heath and it is acknowledged that further work is needed to identify links to the Village Centre. Site 4 has been dismissed as an allocation numerous times. No identified sites for the relocation of Sports pitches. No evidence of highway impact of the development.
Q12	Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss Charlotte Kirby) [2531]		Should delete Site as outside village (>800m from centre), no connections, poor road access/public transport/rail access to local employment, significant environmental/recreation constraints. Does not accord with Challenges/Objectives/Guiding Principles/Vision/Spatial Strategy/Sequential Approach or criteria in accessibility/design policies. SA inaccurate, takes no account of sustainability issues/Government scorecard, unsustainable as will generate traffic on unsuitable roads/improvements damaging to character. No suitable alternative playing pitches contrary to NPPF/SHELAA/Policy P18. Fails to take account of landscape character/heritage assets/design concept/character of village. Conflicts with biodiversity/landscape character objectives/policy. Field between Akamba/Tythebarn Lane/canal should be retained for sustainable extension of village of up to 100 dwellings.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q12	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		Support SMBC Concept plan but only if a minimum 50m of semi-natural habitat is left between the ancient woodland and development area.
Q12	Worcestershire County Council (Ben Horovitz) [6246]		The Solihull Draft Local Plan sets out proposed development on the west of Solihull covering the Dickens Heath and Shirley areas, which are referenced as the Blythe Area and listed for future development as site 4 (West of Dickens Heath - 350 dwellings), site 11 (The Green - 640 dwellings), site 12 (South of Dog Kennel Lane - 1,000 dwellings) and site 26 (Whitlock's End - 300 dwellings). These sites are of particular interest to WCC's Children, Families and Communities directorate due to the locality of the sites and the current and potential migration of pupils between Worcestershire and Solihull.
Q12	Zoe Murtagh [3083]		The traffic coming through from DH to the train station at whitlocks end is a nightmare at the best of times adding 400 more homes to the area most of which will be two car families will create chaos if a new highway infrastructure is not thought through properly. The five different sports fields your proposing to develop on MUST be provided for, it is essential we encourage sport or the NHS will continue to be overloaded with obesity caused problems. Parking also at the proposed new sports fields must be large enough to accommodate high volumes of traffic

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Blythe			
Q13	A & V Blake [4304]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site 11 has now been granted planning permission - Proposed homes increased from 400 to 572 - Will result in 206 trees being felled, which will affect air quality & drainage. - Bund has been removed which was built at Council's request before hotel p
Q13	Belinda Baker [5995]		<p>The Green will loose two hundred tress Currently providing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - habitats for many types of birds including owls and bats - drainage for a site that persistently floods - support for governmental clean air initiatives <p>The high density nature of this application (which was only passed due to a lack of due diligence of minuting at the original planning meeting) will result in a concrete jungle - residents/ children deserve greater consideration.</p> <p>Increased levels of traffic on already busy roads through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 new residents 2 deliveries 3 employees to the site <p>Causing increased pollution noise and respiratory conditions long term</p>
Q13	Cheswick Green Parish Council (Mrs M Zizzi) [2095]		<p>The development approved at Site 11 provides a suitable and permanent green belt boundary that meets the criteria of the NPPF.</p> <p>It is confusing that the consultation is seeking views on Site 11 when it received <u>planning permission during the course of the consultation.</u></p>
Q13	Chris Isaacs [4450]		<p>I do not object in principle to the building of houses here, but of great concern is the proposal to INCREASE the number of houses. The effect is twofold.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There would be less green space and the increase in people would put even more pressure on local infrastructures, particularly roads. How are the council going to address the massive gridlocks that will result; we have heard nothing about this. 2) the effect on wildlife would be totally unacceptable, the air quality would deteriorate even further. Similarly the felling of so many trees is morally indefensible.
Q13	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>better design needed to provide coherent and contiguous development with Site 12.</p> <p>Poor aesthetics.</p> <p>Missed opportunity for higher density housing/larger contribution to affordable housing in sustainable location outside green belt, where car dealerships were instead built.</p> <p>Numbers stated do not include extra care development, and important that actual density made explicit. Need to offset higher density with greater reduction in housing numbers across Blythe area</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q13	Councillor T Hodgson [2532]		Disproportionate level of housing in Shirley/Blythe area, whereas other areas eg Dorridge not taking share. Doubling of density will result in increased traffic/air pollution.
Q13	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		This is outside the parish but impacts on village access but given that planning consents for housing supersedes the previous B1 Offices consent recently granted and is by definition now an allocated site.
Q13	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		This area has known flooding issues and Solihull MBC as the LLFA are investigating potential options to reduce flood risk within Dickens Heath. As a result the LLFA should be allowed to comment further regarding this as any development in this location could provide flood storage and should help reduce flood risk downstream. We recommend that a Level 2 SFRA is undertaken to consider how development in this area could alleviate existing flood risk issues.
Q13	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Identified as an employment site in the Solihull local Plan 2013 and a mixed use site in the SDLP 2016. Would support a mixed use allocation but recent planning decisions would appear to negate this suggestion. There is conflict with the employment policy within the SDLP 2016 and the future balance between employment and housing in the Borough. No indication as to where the B1 uses on site would relocate to.
Q13	Helen Blyth [3350]		Sites 11,12,20. No apparent positive benefits for Shirley and many serious negatives. If all available avenues to avoid building 38% of the housing in Shirley have been exhausted and the housing must be built, then please at least introduce restrictions. Such as; All properties must be small and affordable - this would then give local people the opportunity to get onto the housing ladder. Only sell to first time buyers - this would help property remain at realistic prices, preventing landlords charging excessive rents which are then unaffordable to local young people
Q13	J D Green [3195]		Using part of site 11 for Car Showrooms instead of housing is really very bad planning and I believe that if all of site 11 had been used for housing, then, coupled with the developments mentioned above there really would be no need whatsoever for sites 4,12 or 26 to go ahead.
Q13	Joelle Hill [4425]		Whilst I support this site's redevelopment I am very disappointed to see the potential loss of "tech" businesses with skilled workers. We will see only service industry jobs (in car showrooms) on this site. This is a waste of a valuable and rare brown field site. I am disappointed that the site is being pushed for ever increasing density with the loss of trees and habitat. Good design should enable both to be able to co-exist. Yet again Shirley is being sold short.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q13	John Dancer [4303]		- If need for new housing is so great, why have 2 new car dealerships been permitted on Site 11? There are already 7 dealerships in that vicinity, and could go on brownfield sites in Birmingham.
Q13	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Identified as an employment site in the Solihull local Plan 2013 and a mixed use site in the SDLP 2016 (housing and employment). Would support a mixed use allocation but recent planning decisions would appear to negate this suggestion. There is conflict with the employment policy within the SDLP 2016 and the future balance between employment and housing in the Borough. No indication as to where the B1 uses on site would relocate to.
Q13	Mr Bernard James McGillion [5963]		Proposed density is too high (46 dwellings per ha.) and would be out of character for the area. Reduction in outdoor spaces will not lead to improved quality of life for residents Already traffic problems in Shirley - so a major concern with proposed development Air quality problems associated with increased traffic not in line with Clean Air Policy and Solihull Council policies. Proposed removal of 200 trees on the site (most of which are mature trees) and associated detrimental impact on air quality. Ground water problems. Residents of Blackford Road already have flooding issues. Current measures in Dickens Heath haven't worked. High density living requires associated infrastructure and there is no regard to this in the plan!
Q13	Mr David Neal [5868]		The Green is an acceptable area of development with much infrastructure already in place on the albeit busy Stratford Road. Why on earth are you planning to build another two car showrooms. The area is already saturated with similar sites. You have an opportunity to build dozens more houses on this site and so relieve pressure on the other nearby areas
Q13	Mr Eric Homer [3721]		Site 11 - The Green Of all the sites in and around Shirley this is the one that I consider to be a good location. Any development in this area will have a significant impact on infrastructure however it is an existing Brownfield site and has good transport connectivity. However I am disappointed that a significant opportunity has been missed. Rather than building even more car showrooms this land could have been better utilised by building houses. The mixed use area of this site should be for housing, reducing the need to develop inappropriately on Greenfield sites 26 and 4.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q13	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		As in 11
Q13	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		The extra housing will increase traffic and pollution. Bills Lane is narrow and too busy now.
Q13	Mr Martin Nash [5626]		I live in Major's Green and the infrastructure around is at bursting point. We cannot take on extra vehicles without an obverse effect on the country roads. There needs to be an alternative road(s) put in place to take the traffic away, <u>many use the roads at great speed as Rat Runs.</u>
Q13	Mr N Walters [2802]		Too many houses, traffic congestion is always a problem along dog Kennel Lane and Stratford Road at peak times so development will only increase issue, pollution <u>will also be an issue.</u>
Q13	Mr Neill Jongman [3118]		Object due to both high intensity and location of new housing at the rear of houses on Blackford Road which will result in loss of privacy and potential for noise. 640 houses is far too many for the site. It is proposed to remove the landscaped 'bund' between the Village Hotel and Blackford Road. The 'bund' and the trees should be retained to protect the amenities of adjacent residents, and contribute to air quality. Despite M7's glossy statement, consultation with the local community has been poor, involving a single meeting sparsely advertised and with little time to respond.
Q13	Mr Peter Sutton [5735]		46.5 houses per hectare too high; Councillors objected to high density of Phase 1; Council allocated 400 in 2016, therefore only 158 now needed on Phase 2; more in keeping with houses in Blackford Road; Bund trees and attractive screening around Hotel would need to be demolished; Low density, more trees retained; Low density, more open space; New housing set back, 2 car spaces Pedestrian/cycle access improved Council not set parameters for Applicant, eg maximum density, community facility, shop.
Q13	Mr Roger Tomlinson [5589]		Original application for 400 homes, why the need for such an increased density, especially with the other commercial unit on the site. The felling of 206 trees will eliminate the wildlife corridor in the site and reduction in green spaces. the screening round the hotel was at request of Council. The cramped design of current plan will make access of emergency and refuse vehicles difficult. no plan for any amenities on site. Increased traffic flow will add to already congested roads in the area, especially at rush hour times.
Q13	Mr Thomas Monksfield [2917]		I agree that this site could be used for houses as a lot of this land is already allocated and not part of the green belt. My only worry is the amount of traffic it <u>will add to the already poor traffic in the area.</u>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q13	Mr. Matthew Dawson [5642]		<p>The area is already well served with many car dealerships for a variety of levels and markets, with Nissan itself having three within reasonable driving and public transport distances.</p> <p>The wider area is short on smaller, 1 to 2 bed properties such as flats, apartment or even bungalows for young professionals/adults and small families.</p> <p>No where on the plans are any recreational lands, shops, leisure, medical or secondary school provisions, despite the area already being under-served.</p> <p>Little has been mentioned regarding sustainability or environmental impact, and current plans indicate a large reduction in green space & biodiversity</p>
Q13	Mrs Shobhna Patel [6130]		<p>I am a resident of 10 Rosebriars. It's unacceptable to build so many homes on our door step. We are at an accident black spot corner where vehicles have gone into our fence and increasing our insurance cost. We live in fear already. Its Despicable that plans are to allow vehicles onto Haslucks Green Road. Its already overused and congested. There is lack of infrastructure to cope with the traffic and other community facilities</p> <p>The whole village effect is going to be wiped out with so much of a concrete jungle, forget the CO2 inhalation to the residences health.</p>
Q13	Mrs Brenda Clayson [5668]		<p>The traffic entering and leaving the proposed development will be further increased and will move the congestion further up Stratford Road towards Shirley and surrounding local roads. Proposed junior school will make matters worse for residents as school run traffic will add to the chaos.</p>
Q13	Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]		<p>- I think this is a good use of space, however there is still the question of road infrastructure not to mention the added pressure of more people and cars in an already overpopulated area, traffic will certainly be a problem.</p> <p>- I was also disgusted to</p>
Q13	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		<p>The area has a disproportionate amount of housing planned which would just extend the sprawl along the Stratford Road. This would increase the levels of pollution which are already high. There are far too many car showrooms already!</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q13	Mrs Delphine Sutton [5699]		<p>Not keeping with original promise to only build 400; Cramming in homes for 3rd party profit; Need housing for all generations; Need to protect existing and prospective new residents from noise and nuisance from football bar; Need to keep trees and screen planting for undisturbed wildlife corridor; Need to keep trees and planting for air quality; Possibility of shop on site to avoid journeys by car; Blackford Road ground conditions; Increased traffic from test drive circuit; More sympathetic scheme needed, more in keeping with Solihull's previous standards.</p>
Q13	Mrs Linda Homer [3729]		<p>Of all the sites in and around Shirley this is the one that I consider to be a good location. Any development in this area will have a significant impact on infrastructure however it is an existing Brownfield site and has good transport connectivity. However I am disappointed that a significant opportunity has been missed. Rather than building even more car showrooms this land could have been better utilised by building houses. The mixed use area of this site should be for housing, reducing the need to develop inappropriately on Greenfield sites 26 and 4.</p>
Q13	Mrs Maggie Stockdale [5911]		<p>Loss of open green space Loss of around 200 trees which will have a detrimental effect on the environment and wildlife. Staggering number of proposed houses will impact on services and traffic. Traffic is already problematic on Dog Kennel Lane and Blackford Road Concern about integrity of Persimmon Homes given newspaper articles in national press.</p>
Q13	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		<p>1. Site will become a 'blot on the landscape'. Former hedge that fronted Lucas onto the Stratford Road was necessary for the aesthetic appeal. 2. Road system in area cannot cope with current traffic volumes. Combined impact of all proposed development in Shirley/Blythe/Dickens Heath will make this much worse regardless of any improvements to public transport.</p>
Q13	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Far too much development in area already. - Roads will be gridlocked. - Doctors and schools will not cope. - Flooding and air quality concerns

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q13	Mrs Sarah Johnson [5928]		I am concerned about the flooding problem with our gardens on Blackford Road, as they flood easily. The removal of 200 trees will massively impact on our properties adjacent. We also have the noise and extra traffic problem Vast wildlife on site will be lost The view of being backing onto a house and garden will massively affect the price of our property and yet no form of consideration of compensation has been given to the residents of Blackford road.
Q13	Ms D Richards [5587]		Density and type of houses given outline approval on Site 11 plus trees, wildlife, air quality, environment. Number of houses (increased from 850 to 10000) on site 12 Traffic increase in Blackford Road, which is liable to collapse.
Q13	Nigel Collett [4119]		I have grave concerns about the proposed development of the TRW site and feel the residents of Blackford Road are being ignored. my concerns are : Design Flooding Loss of trees and wildlife Loss of Privacy Increased traffic congestion
Q13	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Identified as an employment site in the Solihull local Plan 2013 and a mixed use site in the SDLP 2016. Would support a mixed use allocation but recent planning decisions would appear to negate this suggestion. There is conflict with the employment policy within the SDLP 2016 and the future balance between employment and housing in the Borough. No indication as to where the B1 uses on site would relocate to.
Q13	Simon Taylor [4550]		- I do not believe that site 11 should be included if both sites 4 and 12 are also included, due to the inequitable scale of proposed development in the Blythe area versus those of other areas, which simply cannot be justified. - However, of the 3 sites
Q13	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Agree the Green should be included given its present approved planning status.
Q13	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		As stated in the SMBC Emerging Concept Masterplan for site 11, 12 and 26 the proposed allocation of site could provide around 1900 homes which would require 11ha of public open space. Clarity is sought as to whether any playing pitches and ancillary provision will form part of the public open requirement to meet the demand generated from the new residents and to help address the shortfall in playing pitch provision as identified in the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q13	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Identified as an employment site in the Solihull local Plan 2013 and a mixed use site in the SDLP 2016 (housing and employment). Would support a mixed use allocation but recent planning decisions would appear to negate this suggestion. There is conflict with the employment policy within the SDLP 2016 and the future balance between employment and housing in the Borough. No indication as to where the B1 uses on site would relocate to
Q13	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		Stratford- on- Avon District Council is very concerned that development at The Green combined with sites 12 and 26 (1940 dws in total) could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.
Q13	Terry Clayson [4147]		The traffic entering and leaving the proposed development will be further increased and will move the congestion further up Stratford Road towards Shirley and surrounding local roads. Proposed junior school will make matters worse for residents as school run traffic will add to the chaos.
Q13	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Identified as an employment site in the Solihull local Plan 2013 and a mixed use site in the SDLP 2016. Would support a mixed use allocation but recent planning decisions would appear to negate this suggestion. There is conflict with the employment policy within the SDLP 2016 and the future balance between employment and housing in the Borough. No indication as to where the B1 uses on site would relocate to
Q13	Worcestershire County Council (Ben Horovitz) [6246]		The Solihull Draft Local Plan sets out proposed development on the west of Solihull covering the Dickens Heath and Shirley areas, which are referenced as the Blythe Area and listed for future development as site 4 (West of Dickens Heath - 350 dwellings), site 11 (The Green - 640 dwellings), site 12 (South of Dog Kennel Lane - 1,000 dwellings) and site 26 (Whitlock's End - 300 dwellings). These sites are of particular interest to WCC's Children, Families and Communities directorate due to the locality of the sites and the current and potential migration of pupils between Worcestershire and Solihull.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q13	Zoe Murtagh [3083]		Although supporting the use of this site being used for residential housing especially since the recent gypsy landings, I do feel that the area should sympathetically developed putting the 'essential' affordable housing to the Stratford road side of the site and the more expensive family 4/5 bedroom properties along the more rural Dog kennel Lane side. This would be more in keeping with the existing properties along this road and the Grade 2 listed light Hall building. Again I hope the highway infrastructure will be carefully considered as this is already a busy through road from DH to Stratford road.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Blythe			
Q14	A & V Blake [4304]		<p>Objection to Site 12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This area has seen significant development in recent years, if this site is lost there will be very little green space. Affecting air quality & wildlife, - The original number of houses for this site was 850 now increased to 1000 will even more be planned for this site? - Roads in this area are already congested in peak times this will make the problem considerably worse & cause yet more pollution.
Q14	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development to south, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission for site 26. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries.</p> <p>Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c.</p> <p>Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.</p>
Q14	Cheswick Green Parish Council (Mrs M Zizzi) [2095]		<p>Cheswick Green Parish Council strongly objects due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of green belt and conflict with the purposes of including land in the green belt - False creation of permanent boundary features by creating new roads and infrastructure - Conflicting information on site area and capacity potentially leading to over development and coalescence - Disproportionate distribution of development in the area - Exacerbation of flooding problems - Detrimental impact on traffic congestion and lack of transport assessment - Impact on the setting of a listed building and historic landscape features.
Q14	Chris Moore [6291]		<p>Object, as the area simply can not cope with anymore houses or cars/traffic. Area has already provided significant growth at Cheswick Green, Blythe Valley, Dickens Heath. Proposal will join Cheswick Green to Shirley.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Chris Isaacs [4450]		I do not object in principle to the building of houses here, but of great concern is the proposal to INCREASE the number of houses. The effect is twofold. 1) There would be less green space and the increase in people would put even more pressure on local infrastructures, particularly roads. How are the council going to address the massive gridlocks that will result; we have heard nothing about this. 2) the effect on wildlife would be totally unacceptable, the air quality would deteriorate even further. Similarly the felling of so many trees is morally indefensible.
Q14	Councillor K Hawkins [2174]		Online petition of 1302 signatures submitted objecting to Site 12. Site will see the development of 1,000 homes, and built on land that is commonly known as "Light Hall Farm". This site is configured with Site 11 (primarily brownfield / commercial land.) The already gridlocked roads of Dog Kennel Lane and Tanworth Lane already witness severe congestion at peak times and there is a serious burden on the area already seeing substantial development - BVP, Cheswick Green, Dickens Heath as well as commercial developments in the area. The immediate area as well as Shirley in general will not be able to cope with the extra traffic this development will bring. In addition Cheswick Green witnessed severe flooding in March and May 2018 and the risk of adding to the flooding problem is high.
Q14	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Concentrating more development in Blythe with extension to Site 12 and closing gap between settlements. School proposed in most remote location likely to encourage car dependency and increase traffic on A34 and Dog Kennel Lane at peak times. Support protection of setting of Light Hall Farm and retention of open space.
Q14	Councillor T Hodgson [2532]		Disproportionate level of housing in Shirley/Blythe area, whereas other areas eg Dorridge not taking share. Loss of green belt/openness impacts on recreation opportunities and health and well-being. Plan fails requirement to compensate for level of loss. Site expanded and extra housing will increase traffic/air pollution.
Q14	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		This is outside the parish but impacts on our key access route and we see significant requirements to attenuate traffic issues, subject to which we see no sound planning objections given the policy criteria not to include site 12 as an allocated site.
Q14	Dickens Heath Residents Association (Trevor Eames) [6245]		This is adjacent to our Parish and impacts onto the main Dickens Heath traffic access. This site if included would need significant traffic attenuation measures.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Dr Andrew Gosling [5562]		The present development at Cheswick Place has shown the flood defences to be inadequate. Further housing on site 12 will cause more water to be discharged into Mount Brook to further the likelihood of serious flooding in Cheswick Green. The present infrastructure can barely cope with existing housing. There is a lack of school places, seeing a doctor is becoming extremely difficult. Traffic levels are becoming ridiculous, the journey to work or school is very stressful. Enough is enough this parish and the surrounding area has taken an unfair share of development and it is supposed to be Green Belt.
Q14	Edward Fraser [4138]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to the proposed size and extent of the site. - Encroaches too much towards the now shelved Site 13. In conjunction with proposed Site 26 this would provide a pincer attack on the now abandoned Site 13, rendering it vulnerable to further inclusion.
Q14	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		This site lies partially within Flood Zones 2 and 3. In light of this the Sequential Test should be undertaken to demonstrate there are no alternative sites available at a lower risk of flooding. A level 2 SFRA should be undertaken to support this allocation. The Mount Brook (Main River) is a tributary of the River Blythe which flows through Cheswick Green. There are known flooding problems through the village. The recent residential development at Mount Dairy Farm provided some flood storage, however further upstream storage is required to reduce the risk in Cheswick Green. We therefore recommend that an additional requirement 'to provide flood attenuation to reduce the risk of flooding in Cheswick Green' is added to the Plan. This area has known flooding issues and Solihull MBC as the LLFA are investigating potential options to reduce flood risk within Cheswick Green, as a result the LLFA should be allowed to comment further regarding this as any development in this location could provide flood storage and should help reduce flood risk downstream. We recommend that a Level 2 SFRA is undertaken to consider how development in this area could alleviate existing flood risk issues.
Q14	Gemma Welch [4413]		<p>Objection to Site 12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I have no objection to the proposed site 11 but extending this as far as the proposed site 12 south of dog kennel lane will further impact on the residents of Shirley. - Traffic is already backed up through Shirley every day and this will only seek to add further pressure. - The proposal of a new primary school is not sufficient; further housing provision in Shirley will add further pressure onto secondary school places which are in high demand and therefore not providing the residents with adequate schooling provision.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Concerns on Green Belt grounds and landscape character sensitivity. The land has the essential GB character of openness. Open vistas southwards are evident from Dog Kennel Lane. Development would extend built development out into open countryside. Constructing a new road to form the Green Belt boundary does not conform to Government policy. Given that the existing field structure does not have a clear contiguous defensible Green Belt boundary to the south, how would coalescence with Cheswick Green be prevented and what impact would there be on openness, developing out into open countryside and impact on landscape character?
Q14	Graham Roberts [4108]		The building of so many houses around Shirley and Solihull is getting out of hand. The green fields will disappear which will result in more pollution and grid locked roads.
Q14	Gregory Allport [2638]		Too much growth in Blythe creating unsustainable environment. Tanworth Lane & Dog Kennel Lane already experience heavy congestion at peak periods, with rural roads subject to traffic congestion. Inadequate provision for infrastructure has led to accidents, flooding, questionable planning decisions.
Q14	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development to south, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission for site 26. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q14	Helen Blyth [3350]		Sites 11,12,20. No apparent positive benefits for Shirley and many serious negatives. If all available avenues to avoid building 38% of the housing in Shirley have been exhausted and the housing must be built, then please at least introduce restrictions. Such as; All properties must be small and affordable - this would then give local people the opportunity to get onto the housing ladder. i. Only sell to first time buyers - this would help property remain at realistic prices, preventing landlords charging excessive rents which are then unaffordable to local young people.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		<p>The Heritage Impact Assessment will help inform consideration of the site's suitability in principle and an appropriate design response to satisfy national policy.</p> <p>Acknowledge the merit of the Draft Concept Masterplanning exercise and how the local authority considers potential future development might respond to the affected heritage assets.</p> <p>The local authority must demonstrate that it has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -taken sufficient account of the evidence base to avoid or minimise harm to the significance of the affected heritage assets -attached great weight to the conservation of those assets, and -had due regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of those listed
Q14	J D Green [3195]		<p>Site needs to be removed or reduced considerably to avoid over development of Green Belt land in the Blythe Area, flooding, unacceptable impacts on infrastructure and on amenity issues.</p> <p>With the large number of homes being built in the HS2 area, part of Blythe Valley Business Park being used for housing, together with 2,600 plus homes built in the A34 corridor over the past two years, there is no need for such large scale destruction of Green Belt land in the area.</p>
Q14	Joanna Johnson [5985]		<p>This area forms a natural break between Shirley and other villages and should be kept as such. A thousand homes is a huge number of properties. What consideration has been made for schools, doctors, etc, and for the hugely increased amount of traffic on and around the Stratford Road.</p>
Q14	Joelle Hill [4425]		<p>I am pleased that this site has seen a change in it's boundaries so that it no longer encroaches on Shirley and Dickens Heath. This site should be promoted to use the Monkspath route into Solihull and infrastructure changes should be made to avoid traffic passing through Dickens Heath and the South Shirley area. I would like to see a strong edge provided between the development of this site and Lighthall House (as well as that propped) and a commitment to prevent future development closer to South Shirley (At Tanworth Lane/Baxter's Green area).</p>
Q14	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development to south, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission for site 26. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries.</p> <p>Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c.</p> <p>Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development to south, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission for site 26. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q14	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Concerns on Green Belt grounds and landscape character sensitivity. The land has the essential GB character of openness. Open vistas southwards are evident from Dog Kennel Lane. Development would extend built development out into open countryside. Constructing a new road to form the Green Belt boundary does not conform to Government policy. Given that the existing field structure does not have a clear contiguous defensible Green Belt boundary to the south, how would coalescence with Cheswick Green be prevented and what impact would there be on openness, developing out into open countryside and impact on landscape character?
Q14	Miss Susan Hillitt [5660]		More traffic onto Stratford road which is a permanent traffic jam.
Q14	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development to south, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission for site 26. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q14	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development to south, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission for site 26. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Mr & Mrs Phillip & Enid Cooper [4457]		<p>Objection to Site 12:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is too high a concentration of development proposed for Shirley. - The Green Belt is being eroded. - Too much additional traffic will be generated. Existing roads are not being modified to cope with the additional load. - Too much additional pollution will be created. Air quality is already poor.
Q14	Mr Chris Burrows [5298]		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Green Belt land. 2. Added flood risk along Mount Brook water course. 3. Road capacity adjacent to site is already close to acceptable limits (including A34, Creynolds Lane, Dog Kennel Lane, .Tamworth Lane, B4102, Lady Lane) 4. Coalescence with Greater Shirley, changing the very nature of the village of Cheswick Green. 5. The amount of development already undertaken/planned in the Parish of Cheswick Green, changing the nature of the Parish.
Q14	Mr David Neal [5868]		<p>The only housing which should be built on this site should be a single row along Dog Kennel Lane kerbside. What you are proposing will, with the exception of a pitifully small strip of land, allow Shirley to be joined to Cheswick Green in the fullness of time when it's infill is allowed. The traffic on this road already causes the Stratford Road to come to a standstill at its intersection due to the vast amount of traffic entering the traffic island as does the Cheswick Green vehicles a little further along the Stratford Road.</p>
Q14	Mr Eric Homer [3721]		<p>Preservation of Light Hall Farm.</p> <p>This is an extensive site and whilst not used to the same extent by the community it still plays an important function. Development area has been extended up to Creynolds Lane contrary to the objective of protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements. Adjoining these areas would turn a well balanced Mature Suburb into a vast urban sprawl destroying the semi rural feeling of the area and be detrimental to the identity and community of the areas. Site 12 provides a valuable green, healthy area separating the areas of Shirley and Cheswick Green.</p>
Q14	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		<p>The extra housing will increase traffic and pollution. Bills Lane is narrow and too busy now.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Mr Graham Cockroft [5780]		- Site would breach an effective green belt boundary between the conurbation and open farmland and be an incursion into the rural area, undermining the viability of remaining green belt. - The gap to Cheswick Green would be greatly reduced. It would dest
Q14	Mr John Carter [5416]		- My home is on Tanwoth Lane, south of the Miller and Carter. - In the two years since I moved here traffic during rush hours has increased significantly. Twice each day for in excess of 90 minutes I am more or less trapped in my house. It is almost imp
Q14	Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]		Concerns that capacity of Dog Kennel Lane, a busy through road would not cope. Safety concerns over location of proposed school on busy road. Concerns over property type being so dense.
Q14	Mr Kieran Ainsworth [5195]		This particular area is already heavily congested at peak times. I believe it could be very silly to allow this site to also be allocated without giving proper timing to assess the impact on local roads before the completion of many other developments in the local area. I agree for the need for houses, but too much of the green space that makes this area a wonderful place to live is being lost. I'm also concerned about the impact on local services given the large Blythe Valley development nearby which for some reason didn't include a school.
Q14	Mr Mark Bruckshaw [3743]		There is not enough investment in sufficient infrastructure to cope with the increase in traffic in this area.
Q14	Mr Martin Nash [5626]		I live in Major's Green and the infrastructure around is at bursting point. We cannot take on extra vehicles without an obverse effect on the country roads. There needs to be an alternative road(s) put in place to take the traffic away, many use the roads at great speed as Rat Runs.
Q14	Mr Matthew Workman [2947]		Road infrastructure is a complete nightmare currently and you want to add more houses and therefore more cars into the network. It can already take almost 45 mins to leave Dickens Heath to get to M42 via Dog Kennel Lane and the Stratford Road now. And you want another 1000 houses added, it's obscene. It will lead to people moving to other areas to escape what was once a lovely area within Solihull.
Q14	Mr Peter Sutton [5735]		Availability of Inspectors Report Degraded view of Light Hall Farm Proposed road defensible Green Belt boundary Concept Master Plan 850 homes: developer proposing 1500

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Mr Stephen Carter [2941]		<p>Resubmission of original objection from 2017. Nothing has changed from then to justify how you (council) plan to sort this</p> <p>Schools already oversubscribed, how to accommodate 2500 new households? Dog Kennel Lane is either a standstill or a race track, exceeding speed limit of 40mph. Particularly congested at rush hour including surrounding roads. Traffic makes crossing roads difficult for pedestrians, especially Tanworth Lane towards Cheswick Green. Traffic on Tanworth Lane already increased since Mount Dairy Farm development. Previous correspondence with Council's Highways team about highway safety concerns. Privacy will be adversely affected.</p>
Q14	Mr Steven Rushton [3211]		<p>Clear defensible green belt boundary currently provided by Dog Kennel Lane and site will involve infilling of green belt between existing separate developments, conflicting with intention of meaningful gap with Cheswick Green. Existing road capacity is inadequate, with peak hours congestion. Site plus The Green and others in area will result in gridlock with difficult/dangerous access to school.</p>
Q14	Mr Stuart Holder [5346]		<p>1. Scale of the plan is far too large. - The traffic in this area is already at breaking point and long delays are a common feature, particularly at peak times. The infrastructure is not in place and to add such a large number of additional homes simply does not make sense. 2. My biggest fear is that the Public Open Space referred to in the document will only be temporary and it will not be long before other incursions will be approved and made in years to come. - Shirley is already saturated.</p>
Q14	Mr Thomas Monksfield [2917]		<p>Dog Kennel Lane traffic and surrounding areas is already incredibly busy and will not be able to withstand anymore traffic in the area. The site 11 north Dog Kennel Lane is already adding houses and to have it added to the south as well will be far too much for the area to cope.</p>
Q14	Mr Vincent Essex [5421]		<p>I commute this way to work daily. It is absolutely awful along DKL towards the A34. To add houses to the South of DKL would be catastrophic regardless of the amount of road improvements as with traffic heading heavily on both ways of the A34, coming out of Dickens Heath, traffic trying to get to various commercial and industrial parks along the A34 would make it gridlocked most days as it is now.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development to south, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission for site 26. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q14	Mr. Matthew Dawson [5642]		Although I feel this development is a worthwhile addition to the area, although I am alarmed by the number of properties listed, which seems excessive and rather crammed into the site. I feel that the number should be revised down, and provision for a few small (corner) shops, green/park space and pleasant areas should be included not only to enhance the site & local area but assist in biodiversity and noise/pollution reduction.
Q14	Mrs Margaret Gosling [6101]		Loss of greenbelt leading to urban sprawl. No defined boundary. SMBC has not done a site specific assessment of this site. Lack of infrastructure to support this development - roads already too busy with traffic jams at rush hours. Medical provision not adequate for current population never mend more. Flood risk in Mount Brook catchment will increase - the granting of permission for development on Site 11 will already add to the problem. Loss of habitats, ancient trees and hedgerows - area includes TPO trees. Not close to areas where new job opportunities likely ie near HS2 development.
Q14	Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]		This Area is called the Blythe Valley because it is a valley with streams and rivers, These fields act as flood plains, with Dickens Heath having already been flooded twice, building large amounts of houses will increase the risk of flooding to old and new homes.
Q14	Mrs Brenda Clayson [5668]		Any green breathing space will be taken away from the area and traffic will be considerably increased. This will result in more traffic being shunted onto the A34 and surrounding roads which will be exacerbated by traffic from a proposed school. The meaningful gap between the urban area and Cheswick Green will be further eroded. There will be significant pressure on schools, congestion, pollution and flooding.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Mrs C Richards [5412]		<p>No expansion is needed. Blyth Valley is yet to be built eroding more land. We need to keep the green space between houses in Creynolds Lane and Dog Kennel Lane.</p> <p>There will be more congestion at the Monkspath island and in Dog Kennel Lane</p> <p>We have had more than our fair share of houses built here and the council need to look at areas closer to city centres before destroying local communities any further.</p>
Q14	Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]		Dog Kennel Lane and surrounding roads simply will not cope with the extra traffic that this site will produce.
Q14	Mrs Carol Clarke [5822]		These fields are natural flood plains, as stated in published documents by Professor Kathryn Moore Birmingham City University.
Q14	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		<p>Disproportionate amount of housing planned here. This site would merge Shirley into Dickens Heath. Traffic is already congested and polluting the atmosphere. Is it really the correct place for a School?</p> <p>Cycle paths would be hazardous and lead to nowhere because of local congested roads</p>
Q14	Mrs Claire White [5399]		<p>- This is already a very busy residential area supporting heavy traffic to and from the M42 Junction 4.</p> <p>- Additionally Mercedes Benz have planning permission to build a new superstore showroom at the traffic island on the Stratford Road - how many more</p>
Q14	Mrs Delphine Sutton [5699]		Wrong type of house being built
Q14	Mrs Helen Lyman Smith [5533]		Using this land will destroy the current green belt separating Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green from Shirley. It will add to existing traffic problems getting in and out of Solihull. It will also impact on services, particularly local secondary schools, which are already oversubscribed.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Mrs Linda Homer [3729]		<p>Preservation of Light Hall Farm.</p> <p>This is an extensive site and whilst not used to the same extent by the community it still plays an important function.</p> <p>Development area has been extended up to Creynolds Lane contrary to the objective of protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements.</p> <p>Adjoining these areas would turn a well balanced Mature Suburb into a vast urban sprawl destroying the semi rural feeling of the area and be detrimental to the identity and community of the areas.</p> <p>Site 12 provides a valuable green, healthy area separating the areas of Shirley and Cheswick Green.</p>
Q14	Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]		<p>Why has a traffic survey not been done. Dog Kennel Lane is already very heavily congested, mostly with Dickens Heath Traffic. Additional houses at Dickens Heath and Dog Kennel Lane will create grid lock. Flooding is also a major concern. Last year saw the worst flooding in Shirley since I moved here over 60 years ago. Not enough open space is being left in flood plains.</p>
Q14	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detrimental impact on already congested road network. 2. Loss of green space and gap with Cheswick Green 3. Impact on fauna, wildlife 4. Significant increased pressure on local services such as schools. 5. Contribution to flooding risks and pollution to detriment of local residents
Q14	Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]		<p>This land is very prone to flooding so building this amount of houses will increase flooding issues in adjacent settlements Shirley, Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green. It will also reduce the gap between these villages making them one sprawling mass.</p>
Q14	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		<p>This is my biggest concern, in fact I am gravely concerned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local infrastructure will not cope-roads will be gridlocked. - Schools and doctors will be oversubscribed. - Air quality will get worse and we all have asthma already. - I cannot park at whitlocks end already so how will I ge to work in Birmingham?

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Ms Nicole Geoghegan [5643]		The entire road system in and around Dickens Heath is now insufficient and dangerous - even with the existing population. A small number of leasees are responsible for the maintenance, renewal, operational expenses, etc of a number of communal sites/facilities in Dickens Heath. The legal structure put in place some 10+ years ago relating to these Common Assets is not tenable with further development around Dickens Heath. Buildings in Dickens Heath subject to recent flooding, contributed to by the lack of balancing ponds in/around the village. Further development of current farmland/undeveloped land around Dickens Heath can only exacerbate flooding risk.
Q14	Nick Tickner [5514]		Dog Kennel lane is already overcrowded in terms of traffic use. Adding 1000 houses (probably upwards of 1200 cars) will completely overwhelm it, and lead to a much worse traffic state between there and Stratford Road, all the way to Junction 4 of the M42. It's also removes any semblance of green belt between Shirley (Village Hotel, TRW, etc) and Dickens Heath / Cheswick Green.
Q14	Peter & Elaine King [3262]		There is enough use of sites in this immediate area for car showrooms etc, we do not need any more land being built on causing more congestion. Flood plains need to be thought about as excess building causes the water table to be interfered with as happened when Dickens Heath was built
Q14	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Concerns on Green Belt grounds and landscape character sensitivity. The land has the essential GB character of openness. Open vistas southwards are evident from Dog Kennel Lane. Development would extend built development out into open countryside. Constructing a new road to form the Green Belt boundary does not conform to Government policy. Given that the existing field structure does not have a clear contiguous defensible Green Belt boundary to the south, how would coalescence with Cheswick Green be prevented and what impact would there be on openness, developing out into open countryside and impact on landscape character?
Q14	Simon Taylor [4550]		- Strong objection to Site 12 - Overall scale inequitable versus other areas and unjustified - Represents an increase from original Local Plan with no justification (although note that shift Eastwards represents an improvement) - Severe implications fo
Q14	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Agree should be included as an allocated site

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		As stated in the SMBC Emerging Concept Masterplan for site 11, 12 and 26 the proposed allocation of site could provide around 1900 homes which would require 11ha of public open space. Clarity is sought as to whether any playing pitches and ancillary provision will form part of the public open requirement to meet the demand generated from the new residents and to help address the shortfall in playing pitch provision as identified in the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy.
Q14	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Concerns on Green Belt grounds and landscape character sensitivity. The land has the essential GB character of openness. Open vistas southwards are evident from Dog Kennel Lane. Development would extend built development out into open countryside. Constructing a new road to form the Green Belt boundary does not conform to Government policy. Given that the existing field structure does not have a clear contiguous defensible Green Belt boundary to the south, how would coalescence with Cheswick Green be prevented and what impact would there be on openness, developing out into open countryside and impact on landscape character?
Q14	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		Stratford- on- Avon District Council is very concerned that development at Dog Kennel Lane combined with sites 11 and 26 (1940 dws in total) could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.
Q14	Taylor Wimpey [579]	Lichfields (Zoe Simmonds) [5575]	Agree that site should be allocated for housing and that it could deliver in the order of 1,200 dwellings, commencing early in Plan period. Concept masterplan Green belt boundary should not be defined by new road but use existing physical features such as Tanworth Lane and a combination of landform, vegetation and field boundaries. Agree importance of GI links through site, and provision of country park. Recognise importance of listed building and need to balance development and setting. Seek flexibility on school location. Propose network of walking/cycling routes and provision of priority junctions along Dog Kennel Lane.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]		Concern that development far too large which would cause serious local infrastructure problems and excessive pollution, when taken in conjunction with adjacent developments in Bromsgrove District. Consider reducing size of development so that it does not overload Blythe/Shirley South area, which is still bearing the brunt of excessive development of 41% while Knowle is 17% Dorridge & Hockley Heath is 7% Meriden 1% & Bickenhill 31%. Development should be spread more fairly across Borough
Q14	Terry Clayson [4147]		Any green breathing space will be taken away from the area and traffic will be considerably increased. This will result in more traffic being shunted onto the A34 and surrounding roads which will be exacerbated by traffic from a proposed school. The meaningful gap between the urban area and Cheswick Green will be further eroded. There will be significant pressure on schools, congestion, pollution and flooding.
Q14	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Concerns on Green Belt grounds and landscape character sensitivity. The land has the essential GB character of openness. Open vistas southwards are evident from Dog Kennel Lane. Development would extend built development out into open countryside. Constructing a new road to form the Green Belt boundary does not conform to Government policy. Given that the existing field structure does not have a clear contiguous defensible Green Belt boundary to the south, how would coalescence with Cheswick Green be prevented and what impact would there be on openness, developing out into open countryside and impact on landscape character?
Q14	Vasiliki Axaina [6002]		Every morning, the local roads into Solihull, Shirley or the Motorway from Cheswick Green, Tidbury Green and Dickens Heath are gridlocked between 8.15am - 9.30am. The same happens in the afternoon from 3.30pm - 6pm. The infrastructure in the area has not been adapted to cope with the current population in crease, let alone any future increase. No cycling routes have been included and no proper pedestrian path from Checkwick Place into Shirley. These are basic infrastructure developments that should have been considered. . The local infrastructure cannot cope with any further housing development.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q14	Worcestershire County Council (Ben Horovitz) [6246]		The Solihull Draft Local Plan sets out proposed development on the west of Solihull covering the Dickens Heath and Shirley areas, which are referenced as the Blythe Area and listed for future development as site 4 (West of Dickens Heath - 350 dwellings), site 11 (The Green - 640 dwellings), site 12 (South of Dog Kennel Lane - 1,000 dwellings) and site 26 (Whitlock's End - 300 dwellings). These sites are of particular interest to WCC's Children, Families and Communities directorate due to the locality of the sites and the current and potential migration of pupils between Worcestershire and Solihull.
Q14	Zoe Murtagh [3083]		My house sits opposite Grade II listed Light Hall, field, copse and pond which falls within flood zones 2 and 3(I think). My major concern other than the obvious loss of idyllic view is the heavy traffic on Tanworth Lane and the flood risk to my property. The lane itself has got busier since the recent development at Cheswick Green adding 1000s more properties all with cars will create even more noise pollution! The flooding to the side & rear of my house can be like the wetlands with heavy rain, building on soak away land will only worsen this!

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Blythe			
Q15	Alison Robbins [4062]		No better than original proposal for Site 13. Traffic in local area is already too high and to add 300 to 400 new houses in this focused area alone will cause major disruption on Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road equivalent to Site 13 and additional pollution. Flooding is a massive risk that is not clearly understood or explained in this proposal. The April 2018 flooding in the area blocked roads and damaged property. If housing is built here, how will surface water be managed with the huge increase in hard-standing through roads and driveways for this volume of houses?
Q15	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development up to the Stratford Canal, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q15	Charlotte Weston [6176]		The quality of the developer proposal image is so poor it is very difficult to understand what is being proposed to therefore make an informed judgement on suitability. It would be undesirable to lose green belt land. This in site alone may be acceptable, but in addition to the other proposals around Dickens Heath will result in significant overdevelopment and more properties than the area can support. It will cause significant issues with traffic, parking, overcrowding of trains and strain on facilities.
Q15	Cllr Adam Kent [5204]		As per Site 4 I cannot support Site 26 without detailed and major improvements to the local infrastructure in Solihull and Worcestershire which will share the burden of additional vehicles. The attached report covers both sites.
Q15	Cllr Adam Kent [5204]		As with Site 4 the infrastructure is not fit to support these additional houses. Already this area is very congested and with a further 350 houses from Site 4 the traffic will converge and be added to site 26 on a busy junction to create a logjam all the way into and out of Shirley. As in many areas local roads are overwhelmed with increasing traffic and infrastructure suitability is a determining factor. Vehicles heading to B'ham will be forced onto Haslucks Green Road and access the narrow Drawbridge Rd and Peterbrook Rd to utilise back routes to the City.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Sets precedent for acceptable gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath, with risk of merging distinctive areas. Entrance/exit not safe. Use of bridleway disruptive and potentially dangerous, and will deter walkers and riders. Unsuitable pedestrian access to stations and poor bus service will increase car dependency. Will place greater load on surrounding road network further discouraging sustainable modes. Accident levels and speeds an issue on surrounding roads, exacerbated by M42 avoidance. Disproportionate amount of housing in area, so Site 26 should be deleted. Where does CIL money go?
Q15	Councillor T Hodgson [2532]		Disproportionate level of housing in Shirley/Blythe area, whereas other areas eg Dorridge not taking share. Loss of green belt/openness impacts on recreation opportunities and health and well-being. Plan fails requirement to compensate for level of loss. New site will increase volume of traffic on Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road and air pollution, narrows gap to Dickens Heath and encloses former Site 13
Q15	Derek Forsythe [4121]		- Understand the need for SMBC to partly compensate for the loss of Site 13, but most unhappy that you openly state - "Shifting the focus of vehicular traffic movements away from the congested Dickens Heath Road to Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road". - As
Q15	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		the substitution of the much smaller site 26 at 300 homes to replace the withdrawn site 13 for 600 homes is a very significant improvement. It reduces our concern over the access onto the heavily congested Tanworth Lane Traffic Islands out of the village by decanting onto a separate road network at Bills Lane. It is also in close pedestrian access to Shirley Rail Station and Bus network and links to adjacent South Shirley estates. The allocation change is supported with the reservation of a preferred lower housing number provision of 250 homes.
Q15	Edward Fraser [4138]		- Object as Site 26 along with Site 12 would form a pincer attack on the old Site 13 rendering it vulnerable to future development. - Increase of traffic on Bills Lane would be intolerable both during construction of dwellings and worse when complete: th

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		An ordinary watercourse is within the South Eastern corner of the site however our 'Flood Map for Planning' only shows the flood risk from watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km ² , mapping of the risk from the watercourse has not been undertaken and as such this is the only reason the site is shown to lie in low risk Flood Zone 1. The assessment of flood risk and easement from the ordinary watercourse should be agreed with the LLFA, however we strongly recommend that hydraulic modelling of the watercourse is undertaken as part of a Level 2 SFRA to inform of the developable area and capacity of this potential allocation. Regardless of flood risk, we recommend an unobstructed green corridor is maintained along the banks of the watercourse for the purposes of protecting and maintaining green and blue infrastructure. This area is being investigated by Solihull MBC to assess potential options to reduce flood risk within Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green, as a result the LLFA should be allowed to comment further regarding this as any development in this location could provide flood storage and should help reduce flood risk downstream. We recommend that a Level 2 SFRA is undertaken to consider how development in this area could alleviate existing flood risk issues.
Q15	Gemma Welch [4413]		<p>Objection to Site 26:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Infrastructure won't cope, strain on school places and provision of GP services, public transport is insufficient, and won't accommodate more people travelling into the city. - Insufficient parking at Shirley and Whitlocks End station, Neville Road and surrounding area already under pressure from commuters parking for the station. - Area cannot cope with further development
Q15	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Until the masterplan for site 26 is finalised the issue of coalescence with Majors Green will remain. Until traffic surveys and analysis of the A34 and surrounding roads are completed it is impossible to suggest that Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road would be any more or less congested than Dickens Heath Road. Dickens Heath Road provides a less onerous, less convoluted and safer route to the A34, the town centres of Shirley and Solihull, the M42 and beyond. Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road will have to deal with traffic from site 4 as well as its own.
Q15	H Reed [4641]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avoiding urban sprawl is the purpose of Green Belt, which this development goes against, joining Dickens Heath, Tidbury Green and Majors Green. - Destroying Green Belt irreparably damages the area and therefore quality of life for current and future re

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development up to the Stratford Canal, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q15	Helen Blyth [3350]		Sites 11,12,26. No apparent positive benefits for Shirley and many serious negatives. If all available avenues to avoid building 38% of the housing in Shirley have been exhausted and the housing must be built, then please at least introduce restrictions. Such as; All properties must be small and affordable - this would then give local people the opportunity to get onto the housing ladder. Only sell to first time buyers - this would help property remain at realistic prices, preventing landlords charging excessive rents which are then unaffordable to local young people.
Q15	J D Green [3195]		Disappointed that a new site (Site 26) has been introduced, Needs to be removed or reduced considerably to avoid over development of Green Belt land in the Blythe Area, flooding, unacceptable impacts on infrastructure and on amenity issues. With the large number of homes being built in the HS2 area, part of Blythe Valley Business Park being used for housing, together with 2,600 plus homes built in the A34 corridor over the past two years, there is no need for such large scale destruction of Green Belt land in the area.
Q15	Jane & Alan Horton [4443]		We strongly object to this draft plan on infrastructure issues. 1. Directing increased traffic onto Bill's Lane / Haslucks Green Road is a worrying prospect on already extremely busy roads with many hazards and dangerous junctions 2. Environmental pollution through increased traffic causing damage to the local area. 3. Lack of primary and secondary school places. 4. Lack of parking for rail users at Shirley and Whitlocks End stations. 5. Not enough doctors or dentists in the area to cope with increased population. 6. Environmental impact through loss of trees and green space.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Jean Hobbs [2983]		Housing is essential we know but the influx of more cars and with building, more lorries to our narrow country lanes, just adds to the congestion that is here already. Whitlocks End station carpark is already full, and the narrow roads and very narrow footpaths, make it difficult to walk safely in the area. Surely before any more planning is given, infrastructure should be at the top of the agenda, or will it take more accidents before this is taken into consideration
Q15	Joelle Hill [4425]		Site 26 could just end up being connected to Site 12 because the two sites form an easily connectable build line that would see the Allocation 13 site vulnerable to development again.
Q15	John Dancer [4303]		- Site 26 very light on detail. Unrealistic that traffic can flow onto Bills Lane and then Haslucks Green Road, due to peak hour congestion, and highway safety implication of narrow road width, and railway bridge on Bills Lane.
Q15	John Robbins [4272]		Objection to Site 26: - Traffic already too high in the local area - Additional 300-400 houses will cause major disruption on Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road, and additional pollution. - Flooding a massive risk that is not clearly understood or explained in this proposal, E.g. floods of April 2018, blocked roads and damaged property. Development will increase surface water flooding with additional hardstanding. - Disproportionate that 38% of new housing in Borough in Shirley South - Development far from HS2 and will create more congestion trying to access it - Inadequate public transport towards North of Borough
Q15	K J Hastie [6297]		Site 26 Whitlocks End Farm The proposed developments in these areas will fundamentally alter the nature of majors green by increasing the traffic Volume far beyond the infrastructure can cope with. It is already far too great at present. The erosion of the green belt area is completely unacceptable and should not be allowed. these developments alter the area and change the environment that residents have enjoyed for years we did not chose to live in a built up area and should not have this visited upon us I object strongly to what is proposed.
Q15	Kate Edwards [3285]		This land should be left alone. New housing in this area will lead to the loss of green belt greenfield land, an increase in congestion on our roads and strain on our infrastructure.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development up to the Stratford Canal, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q15	Landowner Winterton Farm [5795]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Site is located within a higher performing GB parcel. The site should be a Priority 7 site meaning it falls within the 'unlikely inclusions' section. Unclear how the site has been included as a draft allocation when it should score poorly against the Step 2 'Refinement Criteria'. It also scored high against landscape character sensitivity and visual sensitivity and has a very low landscape capacity to accommodate change. No beneficial factors (other than it being in an accessible location) that warrant its allocation within the DSLP. The evidence demonstrates that it is not the most suitable site for development.
Q15	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development up to the Stratford Canal, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q15	Michael Moran [5681]		I object most strongly with the assumption that there is capacity on Bills Lane. Already the Bills Lane/Haslucks Green junction is extremely busy, notably in rush hour, and additional traffic along Bills Lane will produce enhanced congestion notably at the Burman Rd/Shakespeare Drive junctions. Bills Lane rises from the Haslucks Green Road junction inevitably meaning vehicle acceleration in lower gear and increasing, along with extra traffic, air pollution. The Christmas tree farm in its entirety provides a much needed semi-rural buffer for dense housing on the other side of Bills Lane.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Until the masterplan for site 26 is finalised the issue of coalescence with Majors Green will remain. Until traffic surveys and analysis of the A34 and surrounding roads are completed it is impossible to suggest that Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road would be any more or less congested than Dickens Heath Road. Dickens Heath Road provides a less onerous, less convoluted and safer route to the A34, the town centres of Shirley and Solihull, the M42 and beyond. Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road will have to deal with traffic from site 4 as well as its own.
Q15	Miss Helen Cooke [5531]		Infrastructure. Bills Lane suffers heavy congestion now especially at peak times from traffic trying to gain access to Stratford Rd from Wythall, Hollywood, Redditch etc. Once development Tidbury Green/Lowbrook development completed this will escalate. Proposed development would mean additional cars c800. Dickens Heath route also under pressure. Environment. Area rich in wildlife. Feeding habitat for badgers, muntjac. Birdlife and cuckoos which have used as breeding ground for 40 years. Breed declined by 65% since 1980s. Need to protect legacy for future generations. Area already undertaking two large housing developments. Need to consider sites elsewhere under Solihull umbrella
Q15	Miss Janna Hobbs [5197]		- Bills Lane is congested already. - There appears to be no real plan for the movement of traffic arising from the new dwellings. Dickens Heath road and Bills Lane are already congested, and are not designed to support increased traffic. - Proposal appe
Q15	Miss Susan Hillitt [5660]		Bills lane will be the only access for traffic. As the name suggests this is a two lane country lane with no pavement on one side for parts of the lane. It has become a rat run. During the morning and evening rush hour pedestrians cannot cross the road.
Q15	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development up to the Stratford Canal, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development up to the Stratford Canal, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q15	Mr & Mrs Evans [4491]		My opposition to Site 26 is the extra traffic it will generate combined with 350 houses at Site 4. This would result in a minimum of 650 extra cars in the area, but given that most households have two cars that would boost the number 1250 car. - I live on Haslucks Green Road in Majors Green, the traffic now is putting pressure on that road to a high degree, in my opinion it is not acceptable.
Q15	Mr & Mrs Phillip & Enid Cooper [4457]		Objection to Site 12: - There is too high a concentration of development proposed for Shirley. - The Green Belt is being eroded. - Too much additional traffic will be generated. Existing roads are not being modified to cope with the additional load. - Too much additional pollution will be created. Air quality is already poor.
Q15	Mr Adam Hunter [3332]		High performing Green Belt land would be lost, which is contrary to Government policy; there would be coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlocks End, Majors Green and part of Bromsgrove District.
Q15	Mr Alex Lukeman [3387]		Following the removal of Allocation 13 the inclusion of this site is acceptable subject to assurances i.e. Site 13 is protected as nature reserve/public open space in line with National Planning Policy Framework and need to offset loss of high grade greenbelt road improvements are made in full consultation with local residents The worry is that there could be future encroachment from Site 26. Former Site 13 provides the break of greenbelt between this part of South Shirley, Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green. Subject to these reservations regarding the protection of former Site 13 this would appear suitable trade off.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mr Charles Dempsey [5745]		I am extremely concerned that you think it acceptable to push traffic from this site through Majors Green, we are a village with narrow roads and due to current traffic levels we are becoming prisoners unable to get off the drive and living life around traffic flow. The air quality has already become poor and we cannot even walk anywhere as we can't get across the road. Children walking to school are at risk of accident. The infrastructure is already inadequate and cannot cope. Whilst I appreciate we need more housing the needs of current dwellers must also be considered.
Q15	Mr D Tabb [4499]		Objection to Site 26: - Roads cannot cope with the traffic now, do not have the infrastructure to support this at all.
Q15	Mr Darryl Chinn [5708]		The comment at the bottom of this proposal is deeply objectionable 'Shift the focus from the congested Dickens Heath Road to Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road.' Neither Bills Lane nor Haslucks Green are wide roads in this area. A further increase in 600 plus cars using these roads will only increase congestion, accidents which are regular at the bend at the Bills Lane junction and also the bridge over the Stratford canal. There will also be increases in noise and air pollution and an increase in danger to pedestrians. The infrastructure is neither here now nor planned to be to cope.
Q15	Mr David Gregory [5438]		The present traffic flow along Bills lane makes access off Langcomb Road very difficult at peak periods in fact some 2 years ago a fatal accident took place when a vehicle turning right onto Bills lane was hit by a speeding motorist. Furthermore the number of times vehicles have hit the fencing at Gilbert's Farm on the very sharp bend adjacent to Section 26 must now run into double figures.
Q15	Mr David Neal [5868]		This should not be considered. Bills Lane is already a dangerous rat run for Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green developments and any more traffic along it and Hasluck's Green Road will cause the gridlock seen in all the other roads in the area. The bend along Bills Lane where this site is proposed is already a hazardous junction and more roads opening on to it would be a cause for concern. This area with its wealth of trees and open spaces is a haven for dog walkers and ramblers alike and provides an invaluable buffer between Shirley and Dickens Heath.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mr Eric Homer [3721]		<p>disproportionate 38% of additional housing in Shirley South.</p> <p>Will increase pressure on road infrastructure and pollution. Inadequate road infrastructure which is not resolvable. Unsatisfactory potentially dangerous access from Bills Lane.</p> <p>Loss of high performing green belt land.</p> <p>Effect on the water table and flooding.</p> <p>Contrary to the objective of protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements.</p> <p>Should build near employment areas, not miles away in Shirley.</p> <p>Other sites in the Borough designated as amber category in the Local Plan are more sustainable to locate this development.</p>
Q15	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		As in 11
Q15	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		The extra housing will increase traffic and pollution. Bills Lane is narrow and too busy now.
Q15	Mr Gary Seeney [6042]		<p>I am concerned that the infrastructure of the area is just not good enough for these proposed developments. The roads throughout the area are narrow. There is queuing traffic throughout Dickens Heath every morning Monday to Friday as early as 7.00am.</p> <p>Haslucks Green Rd with its sharp bents is already a dangerous road. Tilehouse Lane, Tythe Barn Lane - also busy and narrow.</p> <p>Yet again Green Belt Land is being proposed to be built on, yet there are brownfield sites throughout the West Midlands.</p> <p>Loss of trees and wild life habitat - many owls in the area.</p>
Q15	Mr Hugh Swindell [5209]		Whilst I acknowledge the need for additional housing unless the surrounding infrastructure is improved at the same pace problems will inevitably arise. This development will drive further additional traffic through and already busy area including but not limited to neighboring major's green.
Q15	Mr Ivan Armstrong [5831]		<p>Bills Lane/ Haslucks Green Rd is congested enough without adding more traffic. It is apparent that Solihull planners have no idea as to traffic planning if they have let a new development i.e.Dickens Heath be built without consideration for the future developments, is that what they are going to do with this one? just shift the traffic problem to Bromsgrove, Majors Green.</p> <p>What traffic will this add to junction of Haslucks Green Rd/Tile house lane.</p> <p>Suggest R/H turn only at junction Bills lane/Haslucks Green Rd</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mr J Davies [2104]		This area would effectively help to encircle the previous Allocation 13 area and create huge pressure for this to be included in any future development planning. Development will bridge the gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath, and create one huge suburban conurbation destroying the character and amenity value of that part of Shirley.
Q15	Mr John Bragg [5578]		I object because infrastructure plans to cope with significantly increased traffic hav'nt been declared. Majors Green (Bromsgrove district) borders Solihull at the very dangerous bend and junction between Haslucks Green road and Tilehouse Lane, near Whitlocks end Station. I live in Rosebriars, a cul-de-sac which is very close to the dangerous bend. There have been many accidents and on 2 recent occasions, cars have left the road, ending up in my neighbours rear garden, which backs onto the bend. What are you going to do? Housing developments are fine, but please take responsibility for significantly increasing danger in Majors Green.
Q15	Mr John Gibbs [5865]		The SLP Review Draft Proposal for Site 26 states that this site potentially accommodates 1000 dwellings. In effect, Site 26 butts up to the proposed Site 4, forming a single development segmented by the canal. The total size of this combined development would be 1700 dwellings, and remove the green belt region between Shirley and Dickens Heath, and creating virtually a single urban area of these two. The green belt between Shirley and Dickens Heath is there to separate these two communities and ensure green spaces for urban living.
Q15	Mr John Ryland [5350]		Site unsuitable as infrastructure cannot cope: - Congestion: Bills Lane and Shakespeare Drive both regularly at a standstill during peak morning and afternoon periods. - Rail: Overcrowding during peak periods, with both the Whitlocks End and Shirley station car parks at capacity. - Flooding: Land for site 26 is at an elevation above Bills Lane and whenever there is heavy rain the spill off cascades down the lane to collect at the railway bridge. - Lack of major employer locally will result in more commuter traffic
Q15	Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]		Location could make it more likely that site 13 be re-proposed. Concerns over increased usage of Bills Lane. Concerns that local schools, medical centres, roads, shops and other communal facilities would be unable to cope.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mr Keith Oneill [5194]		<p>Objection to Site 26:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the grounds of increased traffic on roads that currently struggle with the existing amount of traffic through Bills lane onto Haslucks green road and through Majors Green. - Will just direct traffic from the suburban spawl of Dickens Heath onto the surrounding areas of Shirley and Majors green. - Will set a precedent for future applications from the owner of the Christmas tree farm for further 1000 homes. - Will also impact parking on local roads because of low capacity at the station.
Q15	Mr Malcolm Keeley [5944]		<p>Already enough housing proposed for Shirley area without adding site 26.</p> <p>Site 26 displaces warehousing and outbuildings for Christmas tree business, where do these go?</p> <p>Western end of Bill's Lane retains rural aspect, it is narrow, unsuitable for additional traffic and deserves protection.</p> <p>Area already recognised as short of open space - Neville Road Village Green (backing onto Bill's Lane) created 2011 to assist and must not be sacrificed to access new development.</p> <p>Two road accesses to area 26 apparently required. If estate goes ahead, both should come off gyratory required to tame dangerous 90 degree bend in Bill's Lane</p>
Q15	Mr Mark Briers [5821]		<p>Existing infrastructure in particular the road system cannot cope with this additional volume. Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road already over used. A survey should be done to monitor volume and speed of traffic on those roads.</p>
Q15	Mr Mark Bruckshaw [3743]		<p>There is not enough investment in sufficient infrastructure to cope with the increase in traffic in this area. Crazy to even suggest it.</p>
Q15	Mr Marshall Moses [3348]		<p>Concerns about safely moving my car of the drive of my house onto Haslucks Green road with the current volume of traffic. Developments that are being progressed by SMBC have a huge impact on BDC residents e.g. the decision to interrupt traffic flow on Dickens Heath road resulting in increased traffic flows on Haslucks Green road and Tilehouse Lane - what arrangements are in place to ensure liaison between SMBC and BDC?</p> <p>Any subsequent increase in traffic from plot 26 which will access/egress Bills Lane will require a pedestrian crossing to provided in Haslucks Green road Majors Grn.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mr Martin Nash [5626]		I live in Major's Green and the infrastructure around is at bursting point. We cannot take on extra vehicles without an obverse effect on the country roads. There needs to be an alternative road(s) put in place to take the traffic away, many use the roads at great speed as Rat Runs.
Q15	Mr Michael Unsworth [5976]		This development would cause great problems to the local roads and both local railway stations as the infrastructure is not there to be able to sustain the number of new houses being proposed and the number of vehicles that will be added to the local roads within the district. The local schools would not be able to accommodate the number of new pupils that could move to the area and again public transport within this borough has never been able to cope and trying to adding more cars along both Haslucks Green Rd and Bills Lane will cause major jams.
Q15	Mr N Walters [2802]		There should be no more expansion of Dickens Heath!!!! Green space should be sacrosanct and the village should remain as the Councils original concept. Pollution continues to be a problem.
Q15	Mr Neil Jeffries [5728]		I am concerned building more homes here will increase the volume of traffic on Bills Lane resulting in increased air pollution and road traffic accidents. Furthermore, I believe it will cause increased pressure on already stretched public services, especially local GP surgery. I do not believe building more homes on this site will lead to improved public transport links, just put more pressure on the existing services and increase the number of private car owners.
Q15	Mr Paul Guggiari [5936]		I strongly object to this site being developed on. It is stated that moving traffic from Dickens Heath to Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road as a plus point. In reality these two roads are already heavily used and if all of the proposed houses have to exit via. Bills Lane this will result in heavy congestion on these roads. It also erodes the gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath even further. This area of green belt should be maintained to offset the lack of other green spaces within Shirley.
Q15	Mr Peter Sutton [5735]		This site is approximately ¾ mile from Site 12 so should be treated in isolation, having its own neighbourhood play space and other facilities. The Option 3 plan is difficult to read and the suggested road layout similar to one for Toy Town The site area should be reduced to 21Ha, as indicated on the SMBC Concept Master Plan, and providing only 300 houses. Bills Lane could cross the site and join the proposed new road between Whitlocks End Station and the A34.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mr Rajul Pankhania [5755]		<p>Traffic volumes are high already and with proposed development will cause more risk to unsafe roads as they currently stand. Current roads are not appropriate for current levels of traffic and pedestrians are already at risk. Recent development of Whitlocks End Train station car park have caused an increase in traffic volumes. I have already observed students being hit by car wing mirrors as they walk along the roads.</p> <p>This area is at high risk of flooding as per previous high precipitation observed. What is the plan to allow for this and to ensure that the water is managed correctly.</p>
Q15	Mr Ray Foxall [5746]		<p>To shift the focus of traffic to Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road is madness ! Have you seen the amount of traffic on these roads already ? The bridleway would lose it's identity with this amount of new homes adjacent.</p>
Q15	Mr Robert Beach [5883]		<p>- Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road are already busy roads and more housing will exacerbate this problem causing more traffic accidents. - Public transport from Dickens Heath and from around Whitlocks End in terms of buses is sporadic at best and not r</p>
Q15	Mr Roy Walters [5837]		<p>Area now saturated by new builds (TRW site Solihull Village Tidbury Green etc). Losing green belt between Dickens Heath and Majors Green disproportionately to size of area and number of new builds . Local infrastructure CANNOT cope. Major worry about rare wildlife in area including rare species of buzzards, longtailed tits and Sparrow plus at least 20 other species which are in decline and rely on hedgerows, established trees and green field sites . Green belt habitat being destroyed and creating concrete sprawl. These green corridors are needed for future generations and act as "lungs" in what is becoming an overbuilt area already.</p>
Q15	Mr Stanley Cairns [5978]		<p>I recognise that SMBC need to build more houses but I object strongly to the number of houses being built on the Bromsgrove District boundary in particular those either side of Majors Green which is already has overcrowded roads. I am disgusted that in your Consultation Document you state that Site 26 replaces Site 13 which will move the traffic away from Dickens Heat Road to Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road. The 300 houses you are intending to build are in SMBC area hence you need to improve the infrastructure to move the traffic away from Majors Green.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mr Stephen Harvell [6159]		Traffic congestion and accident black spots on Bills Lane, this will only increase. Increased erosion of our green belt.
Q15	Mr William Wright [5900]		Bills Lane is a narrow road with a low bridge, sharp bend and very limited access to Stratford Road. To add a 300 housing estate with the possibility of a further 600 cars is madness.
Q15	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Lack of a clear defensible physical boundary and concern that there will be pressure for further development up to the Stratford Canal, as shown on the promoter's masterplan submission. Site needs to be assessed consistently with other sites rejected for lack of physical boundaries. Severely compromises Green Belt purposes a to c. Site should be re-evaluated and doubtful that stated capacity is realistic.
Q15	Mrs Helen Houghton [3239]		As a resident on Haslucks Green Road in Majors Green, I have to object about the potential increase in traffic which will be forced to go through our village due to extra housing on Site 26. The already congested "Country Road" creates havoc getting off our driveway. Haslucks Green Road has become a "City Road", unsafe to walk through, noisy and polluted. "Shifting traffic movements from Dickens Heath Road to Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road" will simply bring traffic to a standstill. Infrastructure desperately needs looking at. Thank you
Q15	Mrs Helen Houghton [3239]		I have to object about the potential increase in traffic which will be forced to go through our village due to extra housing on Site 26. The already congested "Country Road" creates havoc getting off our driveway. Haslucks Green Road has become a "City Road", unsafe to walk through, noisy and polluted. "Shifting traffic movements from Dickens Heath Road to Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road" will simply bring traffic to a standstill. Infrastructure desperately needs looking at
Q15	Mrs Shobhna Patel [6130]		Its unacceptable to have so many houses built around this area. There is no infrastructure to support it. There is lack of public transport and community facilities. Roads are already overused and congested. Heavy goods vehicles use roads which are so narrow, not allowing passage of two cars. Building a concrete jungle will create a lot of CO2 foot print and taking away the village identity. As residents of the area we strongly object to the enormity of so many houses being built and showing no consideration to the residents in the area.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mrs Victoria Moses [5648]		Concerned about the reduction in the Green belt and the affect on wildlife , in particular the cuckoo which returns every year to the Christmas tree Farm. The Additional traffic which is to be shifted onto Haslucks Green Road and surrounding roads raises concerns about the poor infrastructure int the area. Any increase in traffic from plot 26 will further endanger pedestrians due to narrow /lack of pavements on Bills Lane ,Haslucks Green Road, Peterbrook road to Aqueduct Road and Drawbridge road. Dangerous to cross over Haslucks Green road or turn right at Rushleigh road .
Q15	Mrs A J Randall [5902]		- Bills Lane is very narrow with a dangerous bend which is used as a short cut from Shirley High Street to Majors Green - Local Amenities are already exhausted - Commuters using Shirley station already park outside local residents' homes and adding new
Q15	Mrs A Kidson [6259]		Bills Lane if a busy road now.
Q15	Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]		Development of this site is takes Shirley to close to Dickens Heath and leaves site 13 as a possible washover area for the council to fill in later. Bills Lane is a busy road with poor visibility and is prone to accidents.
Q15	Mrs Barbara Williams [5676]		Don't agree with the amount of 38% of new housing being in the Shirley area. The infrastructure of drs, schools and roads around this areas will cause further problems. This new housing should be spread equally around the borough. The new Site 26 will mean more traffic on Bills Lane, it leaves a narrow gap between Dickens Heath and Shirley and in combination with the newly expanded Site 12 it will end up enclosing Site 13.
Q15	Mrs Carla Hughes [3228]		I object to the use of this site as it still carries the same concerns over infrastructure that allocation 13 had. The roads in the local area simply can't cope as it is with the traffic already forced upon it by Dickens Heath, so adding to this only means congestion and pollution. There are no clear proposals to ease this strain. This is on top of the urban sprawl and ultimately barely any "gap" at all to define Shirley and Dickens Heath.
Q15	Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]		- Although extremely pleased Site 13 has been removed, this replacement is not much better, Bills Lane and the stretch of Haslucks Green Road that border site 26 are extremely narrow with no potential to improve them; - Where would school age children wh

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		Site 26 will significantly reduce the green boundary between developments (300m is hardly a space). Quantity of houses disproportionate in Shirley and using farm land. The bridle path at site 26 is used daily for exercise, walking, dog walking and enjoying what little countryside there is. Haslucks Green Road is one of the most congested roads in Shirley. Bills Lane at peak times also congested. The railway bridge has height restrictions for goods vehicles hence no buses. Congestion in Bills Lane also occurs at Woods Farm during the Christmas season. Accidents occur frequently at the Bill Lane bend.
Q15	Mrs Debbie Grinnell [5765]		I object in the strongest terms the development of Woods Farm. Following the development of Dickens Heath the infrastructure in the surrounding areas has not been developed putting excess pressure on the surround roads and amenities. To develop on Woods Farm would just have a catastrophic effect on Bills Lane, which is already at breaking point and already a high accident point! In the last few years alone there have been many accident one resulting in death. In my opinion to put additional traffic onto this road via the proposed site at Woods Farm would be negligent.
Q15	Mrs Diane Thornton [3107]		No objections providing that the level of housing is kept as per the plan. However, the increase in traffic on Bills Lane would need the Mott Macdonald plan being obtained prior to any permissions being granted.
Q15	Mrs Hazel Reed [3279]		As a Majors Green resident , I am unhappy that SMBC are " Shifting the focus of vehicular traffic movements away from the congested Dickens Heath Road to Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road" You are moving congestion from SMBC to Bromsgrove Council area through Majors Green which is already congested and dangerous due to Tidbury Green and previous Dickens Heath developments. Substantial changes to the highway infrastructure as well as a pavement on both sides of Bills Lane will need to be made. Please note these roads were constructed as country lanes not to handle current or higher volume of traffic.
Q15	Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]		Shifting traffic to Bills Lane & Haslucks Green Road - why is extra traffic on these roads acceptable? The area floods regularly Disproportionate amount of housing in Shirley - spread over Solihull to lesson the impact
Q15	Mrs Helen Lyman Smith [5533]		The use of this land is destroying precious green belt land, which has been acknowledged as such in the submission. Also, all routes from the south into Solihull are extremely congested already. Houses should not be added until the infrastructure is in place to cope with the additional traffic.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mrs Jayne Bott [5774]		Main objection: the infrastructure around this site is already at breaking point .Haslucks Green Road and Bills Lane are already over loaded with cars. There are numerous accidents by Whitlocks End Station and at the hump back bridge over the canal past The Drawbridge pub. Often a queue of traffic along Haslucks Green Road just beforey Whitlocks End Station, you take your life in your hands if you are walking in any direction from the train station. Trying to be seen by a local doctor is very difficult, this will also get harder, a problem for the elderly and unwell.
Q15	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		Support allocation to compensate for loss of Site 13. It is very important that there is more land as open and accessible space south of Woodloes Road as part of the Green Belt compensation enhancements with access improvements and habitat creation in this area to help offset the loss of Green Belt to the west
Q15	Mrs Julia Abell [5604]		The proposal to reroute traffic onto Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road is not acceptable these Roads already are heavily and excessively congested and to add to this is nonsense, im afraid that the Developers of Dickens Heath should have taken into consideration the village roads infrastructure at the time of planning and building not some years after the event and to then to send it elsewhere is absurd
Q15	Mrs Karen Masterton [6102]		Traffic is our main issue with this proposal. The entrance to the site will be onto Bills Lane which a narrow, busy road. This empties out onto Haslucks Green Road part of which is narrow country Lane if the traffic turns left in order to get to the M42/M5 this road is already extraordinarily busy for a narrow road in the day. Also if site 4 is given the goahead traffic from that site will be using the same roads. The junction at Bills lane and Haslucks Green Road is already very congested at peak periods.
Q15	Mrs Kathleen Price [3289]		With the existing building in Tidbury Green, the proposed building of Site 4 and Site 12, it appears that the planners have not fully comprehended the massive impact the 2000 + properties would have on the area. The expansion of Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green has already had a major impact on increase of traffic, more crowded trains, more cars parking in narrow residential roads around Whitlocks End and Shirley stations. There is too much of a concentrate of planned homes in such a small area. Whitlocks Farm is an area of openness and wildlife. Can Shirley itself cope?

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mrs Linda Homer [3729]		<p>disproportionate 38% of additional housing in Shirley South.</p> <p>Will increase pressure on road infrastructure and pollution. Inadequate road infrastructure which is not resolvable. Unsatisfactory potentially dangerous access from Bills Lane.</p> <p>Loss of high performing green belt land.</p> <p>Effect on the water table and flooding.</p> <p>Contrary to the objective of protecting key gaps between urban areas and settlements.</p> <p>Should build near employment areas, not miles away in Shirley.</p> <p>Other sites in the Borough designated as amber category in the Local Plan are more sustainable to locate this development.</p>
Q15	Mrs Margaret Dempsey [5630]		<p>As you intend sending the traffic through Majors Green from this development please consider that the infrastructure here cannot cope with any more volume. The roads are little more than country lanes and we are now the commute route from Tidbury Green and Solihull Lodge resulting in residents being unable to get off our drives because traffic is backed up and stationery. The fumes are overwhelming and it is becoming difficult to walk in the area and children walking to school are dodging traffic to cross the road. Please consider infrastructure before destroying our village.</p>
Q15	Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]		<p>The trees on these fields help with the air quality, more cars and less trees, has the air quality been checked in this area. Bills Lane is a busy road with poor visibility that is already prone to accidents.</p>
Q15	Mrs Pamela Farrar [5858]		<p>Local roads cannot cope. It is inappropriate to as stated in the plan to "shift the focus of traffic to Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road. It is already extremely busy on these roads, living on Haslucks Green Road it is increasingly difficult to even get onto the highway at rush hour.</p>
Q15	Mrs Philomena Beach [5880]		<p>- Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road are already busy roads and more housing will exacerbate this problem causing more traffic accidents.</p> <p>- Public transport from Dickens Heath and from around Whitlocks End in terms of buses is sporadic at best and not r</p>
Q15	Mrs Sally Cridland [5819]		<p>I am a resident of some 40 years on 510 Haslucks Green Road and during the time have seen the number of traffic grow yearly since Dickens Heath was built</p> <p>One can hardly at times in the day get on my drive safely with the volume and speed and if the number of proposed new houses get built where would the added number of vehicles use then</p> <p>This growing problem has been raised a number of times in the past but it has grown to now dangerous and serious levels</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase in volume of traffic on Bills Lane and surrounding area that is unsustainable. 2. Loss of natural environment that is home to wildlife and trees. 3. Increased air pollution. 4. Site will lead to urban sprawl (very narrow gap between Dickens Heath and Shirley) contrary to NPPF, on a large area of Green Belt that scores highly. 5. Development of Dickens Heath is going much beyond its original intention. 6. Disproportionate amount of housing in Shirley compared to rest of Borough.
Q15	Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]		Access to this site is off a narrow mostly blind road that has seen many accidents.
Q15	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Area completely overdeveloped! - Infrastructure needs looking at first (roads, parking, schools, train station parking, doctors). - Also concerned about air quality.
Q15	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This should not be housing! - This should be used to extend parking facilities at whitlocks end station - I can't park now and I get there at 7.50am. How will I travel to work in Birmingham??
Q15	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Make more parking at whitlocks end station instead! Area completely overwhelmed with new developments already
Q15	Mrs Susan Doley [5824]		I wish to object to site 26 due to a lack of infrastructure for more homes in this area and also because the weight of traffic on Haslucks Green Road and Tilehouse Lane has increased massively since I made this same comment on the DLP in January 2017. For this reason I strongly object to shifting vehicle movements from Dickens Heath onto Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road. The rail station car park at Whitlocks End is currently full so commuters are parking cars in Fords Road and surrounding roads so this as a major problem at present.
Q15	Ms Nicole Geoghegan [5643]		<p>The entire road system in and around Dickens Heath is now insufficient and dangerous - even with the existing population.</p> <p>A small number of leasees are responsible for the maintenance, renewal, operational expenses, etc of a number of communal sites/facilities in Dickens Heath. The legal structure put in place some 10+ years ago relating to these Common Assets is not tenable with further development around Dickens Heath. Buildings in Dickens Heath subject to recent flooding, contributed to by the lack of balancing ponds in/around the village. Further development of current farmland/undeveloped land around Dickens Heath can only exacerbate flooding risk.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Paul Hamer [3395]		Highway infrastructure around Bills Lane will be unable to cope with additional traffic from proposed development which will result in increased gridlock and accidents.
Q15	Paul J Dufrane [4410]		I have no objections providing that the level of housing is kept as per the plan however the increase in traffic on Bills Lanes would need the Mott Macdonald plan being obtained prior to any permissions being granted.
Q15	Paula Price [4498]		Objection to Site 26: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Idyllic lifestyle and view of the countryside will be lost - Already lot of building development in Dickens Heath and Shirley Parkgate, bringing increased pollution and health implications - Three local football clubs will be affected - Knock-on effect on young people able to play sport and their health and wellbeing - Loss of parkland and recreation areas - Existing area overcrowded with high volume of traffic - Highway safety issues
Q15	Pauline Daniels [3674]		Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road cannot cope with anymore traffic. Site26 is also prone to flooding in the Bills Lane area. There is no space for cycle routes. Why are so many houses being pushed onto Shirley including numerous senior residences. We are swamped with car show rooms that could have been used for housing while Solihull seem to just build the odd 5 and 6 bedroom house. Shirley is being over populated and any bit of green space destroyed.
Q15	Peter & Elaine King [3262]		As we live close to Bills Lane we cannot agree that this would simplify congestion. Bills Lane is already a rat run used as a cut through and especially at peak times is extremely congested.
Q15	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	As noted in our response to question 2, we have concerns with the site selection process and the conclusions raised regarding this site, when compared to our Client's site at Tidbury Green.
Q15	Real Christmas Trees Ltd [3629]	Twelve Twenty One Planning Services (Mr Charles Robinson) [6103]	It is considered that Site 26 at Whitlock's End Farm should be included as an allocated site. Sustainable location close to a range of public transport services. Full suite of studies have been carried out for the site. Site offers potential for up to 1000 dwellings. without longterm prejudice to Green Belt functions. 3 Options submitted with representation: 525, 750 and 100 dwellings. Could achieve 36dph across the site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Rita Whateley [5581]		I have lived in Majors Green for 58 years since birth. I am most concerned about the major impact that these new builds will have on the area. Our 'country lanes' are already congested at peak periods especially due to the other developments in the area. I have seen our roads come under increasing pressure over the years. We cannot cope with anymore. Extra traffic will cause more noise and pollution and risk to pedestrian safety. You have a duty to protect our Green Belt and Environment.
Q15	Rob Grinnell [5551]		We object in the strongest terms to the development of the proposed land as it represents a significant and permanent loss to the local community with very little, if any, benefit to the existing residents.
Q15	Roger Buckley [3161]		Thank you for dropping Site 13. However, Site 26 remains an inappropriate development area for the following reasons: - proportionality - south Shirley is already taking the brunt of development from Shirley to the M42 - environment - the Christmas tree farm assists with carbon offset and Is an important wildlife area - spatial separation - the urban edge is too close to Dickens Heath. It must be remembered that the context is from a virtually uninterrupted urban sprawl from Birmingham to this site. The distance is insufficient - inappropriate use of Green belt
Q15	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Until masterplan is finalised, the issue of coalescence with Majors Green will remain. No detailed analysis of A34 and surrounding roads to demonstrate there will be less / more congestion. Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road will have to deal with traffic from site 4 as well as its own. Disappointing that Site 26 has replaced site 13. The same perception of a gap can be achieved through public open space at site 13. Site 26 lies within a high performing parcel of Green Belt. Site 13 is a moderately performing parcel.
Q15	Roy Stiles [3286]		My objection is . 1 moving traffic to Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road , they are congested as of now. 2 The house building in this area as already reached its limit. 3 Spread the Housing requirements around Solihull
Q15	Simon Taylor [4550]		- Fundamentally object to sites 4, 12 and 26 being included as allocated sites, due to the inequitable scale of development in this area versus other areas. - Furthermore, site 26 should not be included as it is a recognised Green Belt Area with a high r

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	Simon Heath [3403]		Concerns over loss of green space and informal recreation areas, additional road traffic, congestion around Bills Lane area and poor air quality. There will be additional demands on Doctors, schools, hospitals, shops etc. which are already over capacity.
Q15	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Agree site 26 should be included as an allocated site in respect of the draft concept plan. Members expressed concern at 300 homes and felt 250 was more appropriate given issues currently raised of traffic impact onto Bills Lane and Shakespeare Drive.
Q15	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		As stated in the SMBC Emerging Concept Masterplan for site 11, 12 and 26 the proposed allocation of site could provide around 1900 homes which would require 11ha of public open space. Clarity is sought as to whether any playing pitches and ancillary provision will form part of the public open requirement to meet the demand generated from the new residents and to help address the shortfall in playing pitch provision as identified in the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy.
Q15	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Until the masterplan for site 26 is finalised the issue of coalescence with Majors Green will remain. Until traffic surveys and analysis of the A34 and surrounding roads are completed it is impossible to suggest that Bills Lane/Haslucks Green Road would be any more or less congested than Dickens Heath Road. Dickens Heath Road provides a less onerous, less convoluted and safer route to the A34, the town centres of Shirley and Solihull, the M42 and beyond. Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road will have to deal with traffic from site 4 as well as its own.
Q15	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		SoA DC is concerned that development at Whitlock's End combined with sites 11 and 12 (1940 dws in total) could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District for example in terms of increased cross boundary pressure on infrastructure, for example, the highway network around Earlswood and potentially Wood End. It is recognised that Whitlock's End station is in the vicinity and could relieve some of this pressure. The Council requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire CC as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of SoA District in formulating any plans and proposals.
Q15	Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]		Welcome decision to remove Site 13. Site 26 should be developed tastefully, reflect rural location, taking account of rich native wildlife. Historic Bridleway (Peacock Lane) and heritage asset at Whitlocks End Farm should be left undisturbed. Development should be contained to this site and does not encroach on other existing communities in Shirley/Blythe
Q15	TG Autos sarah Guest [3447]		Loss of wildlife natural habitat areas not being compensated for Bills Lane & Haslucks green road are already heavily congested roads and major accident sites.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q15	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Until masterplan is finalised, the issue of coalescence with Majors Green will remain. No detailed analysis of A34 and surrounding roads to demonstrate there will be less/ more congestion. Bills Lane and Haslucks Green Road will have to deal with traffic from site 4 as well as its own. Site 26 is no further away from Dickens Heath than site 13. Just as Public Open Space can be used to enhance the perception of separation between Shirley and Dickens Heath, POS can also be used adjacent Dickens Heath Road to ensure separation between the urban area and the village.
Q15	Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss Charlotte Kirby) [2531]		Yes, loss of green belt must be offset by accessibility and habitat creation enhancements to area south of Woodloes Road.
Q15	Valerie Morgan [5899]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 38% allocation for Shirley is quite unreasonable - Bills Lane is unsuitable for the volume of traffic this build would entail. - Requirement for schools and doctors would be a further problem - Land is used daily by scores of people. There would be
Q15	Worcestershire County Council (Ben Horovitz) [6246]		The Solihull Draft Local Plan sets out proposed development on the west of Solihull covering the Dickens Heath and Shirley areas, which are referenced as the Blythe Area and listed for future development as site 4 (West of Dickens Heath - 350 dwellings), site 11 (The Green - 640 dwellings), site 12 (South of Dog Kennel Lane - 1,000 dwellings) and site 26 (Whitlock's End - 300 dwellings). These sites are of particular interest to WCC's Children, Families and Communities directorate due to the locality of the sites and the current and potential migration of pupils between Worcestershire and Solihull.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Hampton in Arden			
Q16	Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]		The Plan needs a more objective and detailed review of available infrastructure in the two settlements [of CDB & HIA]. The Primary schools and doctors surgeries in Hampton in Arden and Yew Tree Lane are full, whilst Catherine de Barnes has no provision. Any development on Site 6 will put extra pressure on Primary school and doctors surgery in Hampton in Arden.
Q16	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Strategically important location to facilitate success for HS2. Catherine-de-Barnes is on one of two main growth and transport corridors from Solihull to HS2 and should be recognised as such. Should be making a greater contribution to housing needs, with development to northern boundaries of village. Further growth in proximity to HS2 will reflect the benefits that will accrue from future infrastructural improvements and help to alleviate disproportionate numbers proposed elsewhere in Borough. Would also help to insulate area from affordability issues arising from increase in house prices.
Q16	Dr Linda Parsons [3849]		Why does Hampton in Arden have the statement that it should be protected from excessive development to protect its character when Knowle does not? Knowle should and deserves to have the same protection.
Q16	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle.
Q16	Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]		The Plan needs a more objective and detailed review of available infrastructure in the two settlements [of CDB & HIA]. The Primary schools and doctors surgeries in Hampton in Arden and Yew Tree Lane are full, whilst Catherine de Barnes has no provision. Any development on Site 6 will put extra pressure on Primary school and doctors surgery in Hampton in Arden. Infrastructure for Site 16 wholly inadequate as public transport, education/health/shopping facilities, drainage, roads, junctions and footpaths inadequate and if addressed would greatly reduce capacity.
Q16	Hampton-in-Arden Society (Victoria Woodall) [5807]		No meaningful analysis of the extent of supporting infrastructure in the two settlements. Primary schools and doctor's surgeries in Hampton-in-Arden and Yew Tree Lane are already at capacity. Catherine de Barnes has neither. Local trains only service Hampton village; bus services run through both villages but are at hourly intervals and do not run on Sundays. Taxibus service was withdrawn in 2016. Need reference to the Neighbourhood Plan which contains agreed Policies, Objectives and Outcomes for the next 10 years.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q16	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (John Pearce) [6261]	Capacity of existing infrastructure, such as schools, should not be used to limit ability to provide further development, as infrastructure, such as additional school capacity, can be part funded by development.
Q16	Mark Irvine [5717]		Agree
Q16	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q16	Mr Andrew Moseley [5839]		Questions 16, 17, 18 and 26 within the plan. I fully support the arguments put forward of the joint working group from Hampton Parish Council and Catherine de Barnes Residents' Association response to the SMBC Draft Local Plan (\Parish Response to SMBC Draft Local Plan January 2019) submitted on 03.02.2019
Q16	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		Hampton in Arden has almost all the facilities offered by Balsall Common - main line station, far better bus service, good road access both north/south via the A452 but also east/west through Meriden and Solihull, shops and a surgery. The justification for protecting Hampton in Arden at the expense of Balsall Common is false
Q16	Mrs Debbie Moseley [5838]		Questions 16, 17, 18 and 26 within the plan. I fully support the arguments put forward of the joint working group from Hampton Parish Council and Catherine de Barnes Residents' Association response to the SMBC Draft Local Plan (\Parish Response to SMBC Draft Local Plan January 2019) submitted on 03.02.2019
Q16	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		This area has similar facilities to Balsall Common but has been protected from additional development. Why?
Q16	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Total overdevelopment
Q16	Open Spaces Society (Mr Richard Lloyd) [5451]		In terms of green belt enhancements Potential improvements should be seen in the context of the agricultural use of much of the land, and of the prevailing Solihull Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2016 (ROWIP). Best possible standards and practice should be applied for the physical state of the path network. Registration of unrecorded access rights should be encouraged and expedited. The Local Plan should also define how funding derived from developers will be applied to the other aspects of enhancements to the Green Belt.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q16	Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd [400]	Arcadis (Mr Will Charlton) [3646]	Settlement suitable for housing with its range of services, rail and bus services. Agree that former ammunition depot should be developed to create defensible boundary. Acknowledge infrastructure requirements for the SLP Site24/DLP Site 6 and agree need for open space restricted to needs of new population, or contributions to assist upgrading/shortfall of existing facilities. Suggest CIL funding should be used for traffic calming and wider open space requirements in village. Redevelopment of Site 6 which is brownfield and use has visual impacts, would provide substantial improvement and further enhancement unnecessary. May consider provision of formalised footpath linking footpath alongside railway.
Q16	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		- Proposals for residential site 6 in Hampton-in-Arden is partly allocated within green belt land, excluding former ammunition depot (brownfield). - No proposals given for additional places at local primary or secondary schools for children. - No consid
Q16	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q16	Severn Trent Water (Elaine Ring) [6241]		Severn Trent Water response: Results of our high level sewer capacity assessment highlights some possible risks of the proposed development on the sewerage and surface water network. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. High impact sites in Hampton in Arden: - Meriden Road - West of Corbetts Close, Hampton in Arden - Nesfield Grove
Q16	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q16	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q16	West Midlands Police (Chief Constable) [5044]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The absence of positive references to the need to provide Police infrastructure undermines the delivery of safe and secure development. There should be express reference to the need for financial contributions towards additional expenditure burden placed on WM Police as a consequence of the proposed growth. Seek engagement in preparation of Concept Masterplans and policy implementation and delivery once Plan adopted.
Q16	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	Consultation document indicates that the settlement could support more development noting the range of existing facilities and high level of accessibility. On this basis do not agree with the inference in para 169 that development should be restricted so as not to overwhelm existing infrastructure due to additional demand generated from it. Development and infrastructure planning are integral to each other the purpose of the Local Plan being that development is delivered in conjunction with the appropriate level of infrastructure. It is clear that Hampton in Arden is a highly accessible settlement and contains a number of core facilities, and can support additional development that will itself secure the necessary infrastructure required to support new and existing residents and existing services and facilities.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Hampton in Arden			
Q17	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 'Draft Concept Masterplan' document, January 2019, acknowledges that alternative premises would need to be found for the wood shaving operation to enable the residential development of both sites. This is likely to be problematic given the 'bad neighbour' characteristics of the use. Site preparation works required for brownfield element questioning viability. These significant doubts over deliverability mean site should not be allocated.
Q17	Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]		Extra traffic will overload Lapwing Drive/Meriden Road junction so development should be conditional on an upgraded junction and pedestrian crossing to the footway on the north side of Meriden Road.
Q17	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Yes. For reasons given in my answer to Q16, I feel the site should be included. The masterplan looks reasonable from initial inspection but would need development with residents to ensure appropriate integration with the character of the village. Design and material usage will be key to ensuring an attractive and beneficial development is achieved.
Q17	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		There is a culverted ordinary watercourse on the northern boundary of the site which is a tributary of the River Blythe, however our 'Flood Map for Planning' only shows the flood risk from watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km ² , mapping of the risk from the watercourse has not been undertaken and as such this is the only reason the site is shown to lie in low risk Flood Zone 1. The assessment of flood risk and easement from the ordinary watercourse should be agreed with the LLFA, however we strongly recommend that hydraulic modelling of the watercourse is undertaken as part of a Level 2 SFRA to inform of the developable area and capacity of this potential allocation. Regardless of flood risk, we recommend an unobstructed green corridor is maintained along the banks of the watercourse for the purposes of protecting and maintaining green and blue infrastructure.
Q17	Felsham Planning & Development (Philip Neaves) [4145]	Felsham Planning & Development (Philip Neaves) [4145]	In addition to this site we believe that land at 145 Old Station Road should also be considered for housing development. The case in support is set out in the attachment.
Q17	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or if not available an alternative development solution delivering open space was forthcoming. This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation. Also the viability of the site may be affected dependent on any potential contamination issues as a consequence of the former use of the site

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q17	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 'Draft Concept Masterplan' document, January 2019, acknowledges that alternative premises would need to be found for the wood shaving operation to enable the residential development of both sites. This is likely to be problematic given the 'bad neighbour' characteristics of the use. Site preparation works required for brownfield element questioning viability. These significant doubts over deliverability mean site should not be allocated
Q17	Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]		Extra traffic will overload Lapwing Drive/Meriden Road junction so development should be conditional on an upgraded junction and pedestrian crossing to the footway on the north side of Meriden Road.
Q17	Hampton-in-Arden Society (Victoria Woodall) [5807]		Concerned that development will add pressure to local infrastructure, particularly the primary school and the doctor's surgery which are both currently operating at capacity. Concerned that extra traffic generated will overload the existing priority junction of Lapwing Drive and Meriden Road. No clear plan exists for the development, including layout, and for that part of the land which should be returned to Green Belt. Approval should be conditional on providing an upgraded junction to cater for the additional generated traffic. This should include a pedestrian crossing on Meriden Road as no path exists on the development side of Meriden Road.
Q17	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (John Pearce) [6261]	Site 6 is currently occupied and there is no guarantee will be available for development. Adjoining SLP2013 Site 24 yet to come forward. Dependent on relocation of Arden Wood Shavings, outside Council's control. Land at Diddington Lane (Site 418) available, being promoted, without constraints. Concept masterplan. Poor relationship with Meriden Road, stronger gateway beneficial. Existing dwelling will result in cramped setting for new dwellings. Road hierarchy confused, single central road better and avoids single sided development along E boundary. Open space better divided into smaller more evenly distributed areas. Landscaping within site where needed by topography, with views retained.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q17	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 'Draft Concept Masterplan' document, January 2019, acknowledges that alternative premises would need to be found for the wood shaving operation to enable the residential development of both sites. This is likely to be problematic given the 'bad neighbour' characteristics of the use. Site preparation works required for brownfield element questioning viability. These significant doubts over deliverability mean site should not be allocated.
Q17	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or if not available an alternative development solution delivering open space was forthcoming. This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation. Also the viability of the site may be affected dependent on any potential contamination issues as a consequence of the former use of the site.
Q17	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 'Draft Concept Masterplan' document, January 2019, acknowledges that alternative premises would need to be found for the wood shaving operation to enable the residential development of both sites. This is likely to be problematic given the 'bad neighbour' characteristics of the use. Site preparation works required for brownfield element questioning viability. These significant doubts over deliverability mean site should not be allocated.
Q17	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 'Draft Concept Masterplan' document, January 2019, acknowledges that alternative premises would need to be found for the wood shaving operation to enable the residential development of both sites. This is likely to be problematic given the 'bad neighbour' characteristics of the use. Site preparation works required for brownfield element questioning viability. These significant doubts over deliverability mean site should not be allocated.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q17	Mr Andrew Moseley [5839]		Questions 16, 17, 18 and 26 within the plan. I fully support the arguments put forward of the joint working group from Hampton Parish Council and Catherine de Barnes Residents' Association response to the SMBC Draft Local Plan (\Parish Response to SMBC Draft Local Plan January 2019) submitted on 03.02.2019
Q17	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 'Draft Concept Masterplan' document, January 2019, acknowledges that alternative premises would need to be found for the wood shaving operation to enable the residential development of both sites. This is likely to be problematic given the 'bad neighbour' characteristics of the use. Site preparation works required for brownfield element questioning viability. These significant doubts over deliverability mean site should not be allocated.
Q17	Mrs Debbie Moseley [5838]		Questions 16, 17, 18 and 26 within the plan. I fully support the arguments put forward of the joint working group from Hampton Parish Council and Catherine de Barnes Residents' Association response to the SMBC Draft Local Plan (\Parish Response to SMBC Draft Local Plan January 2019) submitted on 03.02.2019
Q17	Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd [400]	Arcadis (Mr Will Charlton) [3646]	Support Site 6 allocation as contribution to housing supply and opportunity for range of housing including specialist housing for elderly and smaller homes. Logical extension of village alongside SLP allocated Site 24, allowing phased development with sites coming forward separately. Density should be appropriate to character of surroundings and allow sufficient flexibility. Phasing should recognise different status of sites and ownerships meaning delivery in 3 phases to be reflected in masterplan. Any shortfall of open space within site should be made up via contributions to improvements elsewhere in settlement and an allowance made for location in green belt. Any drainage/SUDs feature must be realistic and achievable in terms of ownership, gradient and capacity.
Q17	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or if not available an alternative development solution delivering open space was forthcoming. This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation. Also the viability of the site may be affected dependent on any potential contamination issues as a consequence of the former use of the site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q17	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or if not available an alternative development solution delivering open space was forthcoming. This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation. Also the viability of the site may be affected dependent on any potential contamination issues as a consequence of the former use of the site.
Q17	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	As indicated in the response to DLP consultation the land to the west of this site was allocated for housing in the 2013 Local plan on condition that the former ammunition depot was reclaimed for open space or if not available an alternative development solution delivering open space was forthcoming. This situation still exists and so calls into question the allocation. Also, the viability of the site may be affected dependent on any potential contamination issues as a consequence of the former use of the site
Q17	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	Site is adjacent to the existing allocation in the SLP (site 24) and effectively forms an extension to that allocation. Despite anticipated release of allocated SLP site by April 2023 no planning applications have come forward on the site. Boundary changes have effectively omitted the area of brownfield land, the majority of the allocation is therefore greenfield. Arden Wood Shavings Limited currently operates within part of DLP Site 6 and it is understood that the company has no plans to vacate the site. Previous representations by the company have highlighted ongoing use of the depot and a desire to implement recent planning permissions. This is a significant consideration in terms of deliverability. In addition as indicated in the 2012 SHLAA there are also a number of other physical constraints and limitations to the development of SLP Site 24 that require consideration, including access and local infrastructure, lack of suitable routes to key local services and facilities, poor relationship to existing development, creation of an indefensible Green Belt boundary. Do not object to the two sites within the settlement however given the proposed comprehensive approach to the development of SLP 24 and proposed site 6 there is considerable uncertainty in terms of the overall deliverability of both Meriden Road sites.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Hampton in Arden			
Q18	Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]		Capacity of Site is overstated, as density too high and inappropriate requiring housing with no or limited parking facilities. Should be restricted to elderly, retirement, sheltered housing as the 2012 SHLAA concluded unsuitable for family housing. Development should be conditional on pedestrian crossings on either side of the canal bridge, a roadside footpath to the eastside of the canal, and vehicular access from Friday Lane only.
Q18	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Yes. It is in a strategically advantageous location, which would benefit from access to Solihull Town Centre, the airport, NEC, Birmingham International, HS2 and Resorts World.â€”The masterplan is scant on information, but I appreciate that it is in its infancy. As the plan develops I am confident it will make a beneficial contribution to the borough and the village.
Q18	Felsham Planning & Development (Philip Neaves) [4145]	Felsham Planning & Development (Philip Neaves) [4145]	In addition to this site we believe that land at 145 Old Station Road should also be considered for housing development. The case in support is set out in the attachment.
Q18	Frances Cook [4696]		This site is poorly served by both public transport and schools. If development is allowed on the brown field area only, then a smaller development of larger homes would be more suitable. A pedestrian crossing on Hampton Lane will be even more necessary if houses are built there.
Q18	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Firstly, it is noted and it is agreed that Catherine de Barnes should be a settlement where limited and proportionate development is accepted. New development will assist with the future viability and vitality of such settlements as Catherine de Barnes provided they are proportionate to the settlement, in the right location and contribute to the health and well-being of the community The site at Oak Farm should be included as an but the allocation should include the land to the east of this proposed allocation and the west of Friday Lane

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q18	Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]		Capacity of Site is overstated, as density too high and inappropriate requiring housing with no or limited parking facilities. Should be restricted to elderly, retirement, sheltered housing as the 2012 SHLAA concluded unsuitable for family housing. Development should be conditional on pedestrian crossings on either side of the canal bridge, a roadside footpath to the eastside of the canal, and vehicular access from Friday Lane only. Concept Masterplan Site 24 light on landscape assessment and lacks a masterplan. Capacity of Site 24 (Oak Farm) is overstated.
Q18	Hampton-in-Arden Society (Victoria Woodall) [5807]		Any development here needs to include sufficient car parking space as local public transport services are wholly inadequate. Concern that 80 dwellings could only be achieved through the construction of multi-storey apartments or tightly packed terraced homes with no or limited parking facilities, which would be wholly inappropriate. Consider that 2012 SHLAA conclusions on this site still apply. We propose some conditions on developing Site 24 (Oak Farm)
Q18	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Firstly, it is noted and it is agreed that Catherine de Barnes should be a settlement where limited and proportionate development is accepted. New development will assist with the future viability and vitality of such settlements as Catherine de Barnes provided they are proportionate to the settlement, in the right location and contribute to the health and well-being of the community. The site at Oak Farm should be included as an allocation but the allocation should include the land to the east of this proposed allocation and the west of Friday Lane (the full extent of site 136)
Q18	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Site 2, 21 and 96 compare favourably with allocated site 24 and should be allocated in addition. Indeed, Site 24 is within a highly performing parcel in the GBA, whereas Sites 2, 21 and 96 are lower performing.
Q18	Mr Andrew Moseley [5839]		Questions 16, 17, 18 and 26 within the plan. I fully support the arguments put forward of the joint working group from Hampton Parish Council and Catherine de Barnes Residents' Association response to the SMBC Draft Local Plan (\Parish Response to SMBC Draft Local Plan January 2019) submitted on 03.02.2019

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q18	Mr Duncan McArdle [5645]		<p>We are supportive, conditional on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. House density reduced to medium to low and kept to a maximum of 2 storeys, to fit with the visual amenity of the village 2. Adequate parking and facilities on site, to reduce further congestion in the village and serve residents needs 3. Vehicular site access only from Friday Lane, as already high traffic loading on Hampton Lane 4. Footpaths and crossings for pedestrians established into and in CdB, to increase safety and ease of access 5. Established trees protected and landscaping established on all site boundaries to
Q18	Mr Francis Ryan [3584]		<p>It is possible that Oak Farm could be considered for development but not as Residential.</p> <p>the existing infrastructure is totally inadequate to support Residential development and would completely compromise existing facilities and any notable increase in traffic would only add to the already heavily congested scenario currently experienced, particularly on Hampton Lane.</p> <p>This site was rejected within the 2012 SHLAA for specific reasons which remain unchanged today.</p> <p>'Natural' villages such as Catherine De Barnes, part of Solihull's distinct character, rely heavily on Green Belt status protection and development proposals of this nature will erode and destroy that valued character.</p>
Q18	Mr Giles Cook [5299]		<p>In principle agree to it being a suitable site.</p> <p>Housing density is too high if just using the brownfield part of the site.</p> <p>Will need pedestrian crossing or canal bridge to access the village.</p> <p>Is the proposed access still to be on Friday Lane?</p>
Q18	Mr Stephen Fisher [5659]		<p>We are concerned about the density of housing being too great and are concerned about noise and light pollution, also we are very concerned about the visual impact of the proposed development.</p> <p>Although we accept that there is a need for affordable housing in the village, the scale of development in the area has increased intensely and are concerned that we will lose the rural and village setting that it has.</p>
Q18	Mrs Debbie Moseley [5838]		<p>Questions 16, 17, 18 and 26 within the plan. I fully support the arguments put forward of the joint working group from Hampton Parish Council and Catherine de Barnes Residents' Association response to the SMBC Draft Local Plan (\Parish Response to SMBC Draft Local Plan January 2019) submitted on 03.02.2019</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q18	Mrs Kate Hillman [5535]		C-de-B does not have enough amenities or infrastructure for 80 new dwellings. This is more than a fifth of the current size of C-de-B. Hampton Lane is an extremely busy through road. Catherine-De-Barnes has no school. There is no other available parking in the village. Concerns over the number of dwellings and the density. The small field bordering Hampton Lane / Grand Union Canal is the gateway to the village before entering the built up areas. I feel this section of field should not be built on. It has not been 'previously developed' and has no current buildings on.
Q18	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		This area has not seen as much development as other parts of borough
Q18	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		No problem with redevelopment of the brownfield part of the Farm being allocated for residential subject to careful treatment of the frontage to the canal. But it would be disastrous for the remainder of the site being developed so urbanising the entrance to Catherine de Barnes from the East. The protection of that green edge to the village is critical for the protection of the rest of the Green Belt.
Q18	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q18	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Firstly, it is noted and it is agreed that Catherine de Barnes should be a settlement where limited and proportionate development is accepted. New development will assist with the future viability and vitality of such settlements as Catherine de Barnes provided they are proportionate to the settlement, in the right location and contribute to the health and well-being of the community. The site at Oak Farm should be included as an but the allocation should include the land to the east of this proposed allocation and the west of Friday Lane.
Q18	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Firstly, it is noted and it is agreed that Catherine de Barnes should be a settlement where limited and proportionate development is accepted. New development will assist with the future viability and vitality of such settlements as Hampton in Arden and Catherine de Barnes provided they are proportionate to the settlement, in the right location and contribute to the health and well-being of the community. The site at Oak Farm should be included as an allocation as promoted in the submission to the SDLP 2016 consultation (Site Ref 136). However, the allocation should include the land to the east of this proposed allocation and the west of Friday Lane.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Hockley Heath			
Q19	Alan Pickford [6029]		<p>There is limited access and availability of utilities to accommodate 100 plus houses.</p> <p>Hockley Heath Academy is already oversubscribed, how many school aged places would be required for 100 plus houses.</p> <p>There is a lack of facilities within walking distance bearing in mind the aim to cut down on vehicular journeys, in particularly a lack of a doctor, pharmacy, bank etc.</p> <p>An ATM would be a useful addition to the village, especially as the local post office is under threat.</p>
Q19	Amanda Knight [5620]		<p>HH village has limited and inadequate infrastructure/services to cope with additional residential housing.</p> <p>The village has limited amenities and lacks key services: no Doctors surgery (necessary for older residents); limited public transport; very small retail provision; very limited employment opportunities.</p> <p>School Road suffers parking congestion from the Primary and Nursery School. The School could be overwhelmed with requests for more school places.</p> <p>The A3400 is continually over trafficked and difficult to access from School Road. Blythe Valley homes will put excessive pressure on School Road which is narrow, winding and liable to flooding.</p>
Q19	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>To a certain extent, yes.</p> <p>Whilst development is limited by the Borough boundary, it is important to work with neighbouring authorities to ensure any expansion remains proportionate and coherent. One sided development has the potential to disturb the coherence of the settlement.</p>
Q19	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>No objection in principle although consideration should be given to enable the provision of a doctors surgery.</p>
Q19	Hockley Heath Parish Council (Cllr Greg McDougall) [3819]		<p>TfWM have changed bus services from Hockley Heath to Solihull and Dorridge station to an hourly service due to timetabling.</p> <p>Our survey, published in June 2018 as a part of the Neighbourhood Plan development process, had 87% of respondents indicating it was very important for highway changes to School Road to prevent excessive vehicle use arising from additional Blythe Valley Park development.</p> <p>The village, and specifically the A3400, suffers from regular flooding/ponding following even moderate sustained rainfall.</p> <p>Pockets of Hockley Heath still do not have access to "super fast" broadband and anecdotal reports of poor water pressure.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms Jenny McDougall) [1921]		No bus service to Birmingham and infrequent service to Solihull & Dorridge (approx every 45-60 mins). Development represents 12% increase in village size with no infrastructure improvements. Possibly 50 more homes with washed over areas. No medical facilities near Hockley Heath. Primary school cannot accomodate the number of children from 100-150 dwellings. Congestion on A3400 (a bypass for M42/M40) leads to School Road being used as a short cut. Regular flooding on School Road and A3400. Poor water pressure. <u>Pockets of village with no access to fibre broadband.</u>
Q19	Hockley Heath Residents Association (Jennie Lunt) [6020]		The Hockley Heath Residents Association do not consider that this is a complete list of infrastructure requirements for Hockley Heath, either for the current level of residents or for the settlement in the future
Q19	Katrina Redmond-Lyon [5293]		There doesn't seem to be much here on the infrastructure requirements for HH. A quicker, more direct bus service to Solihull would be good and cycle paths to Dorridge, Henley and Solihull would mean safer and more accessible bike riding for locals. This may also encourage more bike riding to school. Some improvements to the park facilities could be made ie- fitness stations and a tennis court to bring HH park up to the standard of Knowle.
Q19	Linda boyle [5885]		- Currently lots of congestion on School Road. It is a narrow Rd with no footpath on one side. More development will lead to more congestion. This is particularly dangerous for children walking to school. <u>- Whilst Parish Council will receive money - the</u>
Q19	Lucy Shepherd [5792]		Whilst I sympathise with Hockley Heath residents, it is an area prime for development given its location and ease of access to the motorway and surrounding areas. It does not have a village character, centre, or historic buildings in the same way as other nearby villages such that development would not be as detrimental. Given ease of access and closeness to facilities such as golf clubs, health clubs and national trust properties, it is ideal for young families and a new school. It seems logical to add on to existing development here.
Q19	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle although consideration should be given to enable the provision of a doctors surgery.
Q19	Miss Davinia Fisher [5938]		It's green belt land, not enough local shops , schools, doctors. Too much traffic in Hockley Heath

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Miss Deborah Bunce [5414]		Hockley Heath does not have the facilities for more households. Infrastructure in Hockley Heath will not accommodate this significant rise in households. There are few public transport options, limited shops for locals and the school is already crammed onto a small site
Q19	Miss Krystyna McMullen [5986]		There isn't enough infrastructure in the village to support the people we already have, never mind more! The school is full, there isn't a senior school for miles, there isn't a train station, the bus routes are limited, we do not have a doctor's surgery or pharmacy, and only have one dentist, that needs at least 6 weeks advance booking. More houses would be chaos.
Q19	Mr Colin Redmond-Lyon [5294]		School traffic congestion is a problem. A new parking area is needed in walking distance of the school. Paths, pavements and cycle paths need enhancement and widening with crossings where appropriate giving an easy, attractive option for out of area parents to park and walk to the school. Walking/cycling routes need to be improved to enable all residents to walk safely down attractive corridors from home to school, shops, pubs etc. Transport for non-drivers also needs improvement with cycleways/walkways to Earlswood and Dorridge train stations. Also need to plan autonomous taxi rank areas to be ready for this technology.
Q19	Mr Dave Tarbuck [5989]		The village needs to be protected in order to keep the quality of life for residents
Q19	Mr David Higgins [5621]		Parking problems outside the School. Traffic and congestion along School Road and through the village. No plan in place to improve flooding risk. Why is there no action plan to address the serious flooding on the A3400 in May 2018? The village is short of key infrastructure to support the current population, at a minimum a doctor's surgery and pharmacy is required, the Post Office needs to be replaced as the current owners want to retire.. The new development suggested makes this unlikely to happen as it doesn't appear to be zoned as retail services space but solely housing.
Q19	Mr David Sheppard [5456]		There is no doctor's surgery ,the school is full, the bus service is limited and the canal is a linear heritage asset requiring protection from mediocre development. Future expansion due is limited due to the inadequate infrastructure. Protection is required from excessive development where it impacts on the character and attractiveness of the village, the Green Belt and the national heritage asset of the canal. The safety of children at the school is of paramount importance School Road is already inadequate for existing traffic and has been much damaged over the winter. Any future development should adjoin the main road.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Mr Derek Hormel [5415]		Additional traffic generated by 100 new homes at site 25 and the Blythe Valley development will add to the likelihood of accidents, especially at school times.
Q19	Mr Eddie Boyle [5949]		No just 100% no. I dont want our lovely village turned into a large town. We have a beautiful quiet semi rural village we dont need more houses here taking away the beautiful countryside. Our little school and roads wont cope.
Q19	Mr G Findlay [1904]		Clearly the counter matters measures suggested have not been thought through and are inadequate. No amount of traffic calming or other projects could reduce the inevitable congestion, safety issues and detriment to the environment impacted by the proposed changes.
Q19	Mr Guy Thompson [5364]		<p>No further housing developments are needed as the village does not have the amenities or infrastructure to cope.</p> <p>Parking on School Road is making it difficult to exit and enter driveways next to School Rd.</p> <p>Parking restrictions are needed along the road.</p> <p>School will not cope with the increase of pupils.</p>
Q19	Mr John L Thomas [5355]		<p>I agree there needs to be improvements, but the considerations are only concerning parking for the school along School Road. There are issues with the lay by on the bend in School Road, cars parked in front of homes frequently stick out into the traffic lane, this is dangerous as width of the road is already narrow and there have been near misses from speeding traffic.</p> <p>School parking issues do not apply just to School Road, living on the first home in Tutnall Drive, we have cars parked on both sides of the road, frequently blocking access into our drive.</p>
Q19	Mr John Roby [5802]		<p>Congestion around school pick up and drop off times is a big problem. It can only be alleviated by providing facilities elsewhere to accomodate vehicles entering and leaving at the same time. But where?</p> <p>The bend between the school and Stratford road is very narrow especially when cars are parked in the layby (which is too narrow for them) and opposite where they park half on the pavement.</p>
Q19	Mr Ken Bridgwater [5912]		The infrastructure within HH is not sufficiently capable of supporting a development of this size (site 25) due to a lack of facilities such as shops and there is no medical facility. There is a density of housing already in the village which leads to congestion and pollution issues.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Mr Krushi Hindocha [5677]		-The issues identified do not adequately protect the character and attractiveness of the village. There aren't enough shops, doctors, dentists, other amenities etc to support such a growth in the village, particularly if there is development at Blythe Val
Q19	Mr M Sabin [2597]		The road, which is both "rat-run" and a local racetrack, is too narrow to support existing traffic and parking needs. There's no Doctor or pharmacy nearby, and no regular buses. How could any right-minded individual expect my support for this development?
Q19	Mr Matt Barran [5408]		School Road is already at capacity with local traffic. This is a danger to our local children attending school, especially when arriving and leaving school. Water pressure is at a low in the viillage and must be addressed. There are already limited school spaces available with a waiting list in many year groups and not ready for the proposed increase in village size of 12% and are not capable of growing at a rate to match housing.
Q19	Mr Paul Hamilton [5683]		School Road is not capable of coping with the existing traffic using it, there will be a influx of more traffic from the Blyth Valley development. Further development this will put strain on the local infrastructure, major works will be needed to improve utilities, traffic systems need to be installed, and added pollution levels will rise, the Blyth Valley development is surely a big enough expansion within the local area for now, why do we need to build on more Green belt land
Q19	Mr Paul Mansell [5994]		No more development around hockley heath. The roads are not built to support such a large volume of traffic and the homes that are already being built at Blythe valley will compound this issue. There are already a number of concerns with lack of infrastructure such as no doctors etc.
Q19	Mr Paul Pendleton [6106]		The infrastructure does not exist to support development of the scale or location proposed. There is no doctors surgery. the local primary school does not have the capacity. The A3400 is used as a diversion for both the M40 and M42 and as such Hockley Heath experiences frequent congestion along the A3400 and connecting routes, with School Road being used to bypass congestion on the A3400.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Mr Phil Barnett [5644]		<p>The scope of the identified requirements does not cover the issues that arise from this development. Issues along School Road are more than those associated with school start and end times.</p> <p>Other areas of infrastructure to consider is :-</p> <p>The reduction in regular Bus Services from the village to Birmingham, Stratford upon Avon and Solihull.</p> <p>Remoteness from telephone service points leading to a significantly degraded internet speed through broadband</p> <p>Regular flooding of Stratford Road, School Road and Aylesbury Road</p> <p>Over subscription to the primary school leading to locals not able to access the</p>
Q19	Mr Phil Roalfe [5394]		<p>Any significant additional development will adversely affect the congestion issues around the school - assuming the school has any capacity for the additional places that would inevitably be required unless the catchment area is reduced so the vast majority would be within walking distance and are encouraged to walk to school each day</p> <p>Concerned that this number of additional houses will overload local roads and infrastructure and that Green belt is being eroded</p>
Q19	Mr Philip Jordan [5499]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - additional traffic along School Road which was never designed for such volume - congestion is already bad around the Hockley Heath Academy and clearly unsafe for children - the junction at School Road / Stratford Road is already congested and danger
Q19	Mr Richard Rendle [6148]		<p>Existing parking problems, particularly around the school will be exacerbated by additional development.</p> <p>Parts of School Road are dangerous due to speeding vehicles.</p> <p>Flooding is an issue in the area.</p> <p>Lack of facilities in the village including doctors surgery and pharmacy. The infrastructure is inadequate to support additional development, including the primary school and public transport</p>
Q19	Mr Sam Tarbuck [5990]		<p>Parking already an issue.</p>
Q19	Mr Simon Geen [5975]		<p>Stratford road through the village already gets very congested during rush hour and when there are issues with the M40 and M42. The school has limited space for expansion to cope with a big increase in the number of children. There are no nearby secondary schools and limited bus services for those reliant on public transport. There is not a doctors surgery in the village.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Mr Stephen Batchelor [5413]		Believe that there is no way to mitigate the impact of traffic on School Road. It needs control, and will only get worse with traffic from Blythe Valley School is at maximum capacity already - there is no room for growth
Q19	Mr T Thomas [2538]		Plans for Hockley Heath are out of proportion to the size of the village, adding 19% new housing and putting pressure on the local infrastructure. School Road is rural and already recognised as a serious problem for traffic and cyclists using it. 150 new homes together with traffic from the major Blythe Valley development using it as a "rat run" will only make it far worse.
Q19	Mr Terry Gow [5905]		No I do not agree. The road is not suitable for more developments with young children using it. Also Blythe Valley will be using it once the 900 homes go up. <u>Totally lacking in infrastructure can not cope.</u>
Q19	Mr Toby Harris [5265]		- Public transport not good enough for increased number of residents - Traffic generation. School Road is not adequate for the amount of traffic generated. - Highway Safety. Increased traffic around the school will be dangerous to pupils. - Drainage.
Q19	Mr Tom Porter [5422]		This area is yet to see the real impact of the Nearby developments in Blythe Valley where some 1000 homes are to be built. We are already in siege with traffic especially when M42 is busy and the Stratford rd is used as a by-pass. We have had local developments on all sides of HH already and we should not be misled about additional revenue for the Parish Council. The deep joy of having extra funds to allow us to paint the local Flower beds so that when we sit in traffic jams enjoying the colours !
Q19	Mrs B Thomas [5785]		School Rd is too narrow and school is almost full. No dr or dentist here either
Q19	Mrs Joanne Jackson [5486]		Infrastructure will not cope with additional development. The existing highway infrastructure is unsuitable and speeding traffic is already an issue. There is already 1000 houses being built in Blythe Valley, therefore more infrastructure in the local area is not required.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Mrs Alethiea De Pasquale [5678]		There is simply not enough infrastructure in and around the village to accommodate the plans. Both in amenities, services and space (in relation to school road). There is no doctors, pharmacy or many daily use shops. The Primary school lacks capacity. The infrastructure of school road alone is not up to par. The road is much too narrow to accommodate such a load of traffic and children would be in grave danger as it is already a road that people speed up. Traffic is already set to increase drastically on school road with Blythe Valley.
Q19	Mrs Amanda Harris [5266]		I object to the proposed development because:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic generation. School Road & village road structure cannot cope. - Highway Safety. Increased traffic will be a danger to pupils. - Drains. The village drainage system already struggles. - Health. It is already difficult to get a GP appointment. - Public Transport is already poor and would need to be improved.
Q19	Mrs Barbara Lawton [5737]		The village has already had approximately 120 houses built recently. The road infrastructure could not cope with any more additional dwellings, we will already be having extra traffic from the new Blythe Valley travelling through the village on roads which are already unsuitable and heavily used. The drainage is already struggling causing the drains to back up and flood in various places regularly. I believe the countryside and wildlife should be protected under the greenbelt and I therefore would not like to see this application go ahead.
Q19	Mrs Barbara Lawton [5737]		With the proposed parking solution this does not solve the problem with the children as they will have to cross School Road to get to School. School Road is mainly a very narrow lane, with no edges/kerb stone with no pavements. The tarmac has just set where it fell leaving huge pot holes on either side. These cannot be seen until you fall into them. Bollards have been in these for a year now with no action, leaving a very dangerous situation. Proving the road can't cope at present and couldn't cope with any additional traffic

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Mrs Barbara Lawton [5737]		With the proposed parking solution this does not solve the problem with the children as they will have to cross School Road to get to school. School Road is mainly a very narrow lane with no edges/Kerb stone and pavements. The tarmac has just set where it fell leaving huge pot holes on either side. These cannot be seen until you fall into them, bollards have been in place for a year with no action leaving a very dangerous situation. Proving the road can't cope at present and could not cope with additional traffic.
Q19	Mrs C Richards [5412]		Far too many properties for a rural environment. Blyth Valley is yet to be built with over 700 homes. most houses have at least 2 vehicles which will add more congestion/pollution to our roads as public transport is not reliable or regular in rural areas.
Q19	Mrs Collette Higgins [6109]		The infrastructure within Hockley Heath is not sufficiently capable of supporting a development of this size; 100 homes is a 12% increase (approximately)
Q19	Mrs Emma Gaskin-Farley [5996]		The development is an unnecessary expansion of a village which has retained its character due to the Greenbelt which surrounds it. Should the development go ahead, School road will become more hazardous than it is presently to pedestrians & in particular children, in addition to road users around the area of Hockley Heath Academy during school drop off & collection times. In addition, the current infrastructure of the village is insufficient to support the addition of yet more homes.
Q19	Mrs Fiona Holland [5418]		The school parking is just one element of a much wider infrastructure that needs to be considered. The new housing in School road - The Spitfire development has led to increased traffic flow in School Road on top of the existing school parking issue. This is already extremely dangerous. Further homes with the associated cars/children would really increase this risk. Any additional would impact upon the entry and exit . There are insufficient facilities within the village - no doctors surgery, one single shop - One Stop shop and very minimal bus services. There is no village car park.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Mrs Hannah Richmond [5632]		<p>The infrastructure within Hockley Heath is not sufficiently capable of supporting a development of this size and is a terrible idea.</p> <p>Poor public transport links and services; large range of shops lacking; no doctors or pharmacy; insufficient capacity at local primary school; The A3400 is used as a diversion for both the M40 and M42 and as such Hockley Heath experiences frequent congestion along the A3400 and connecting routes, with School Road being used to bypass congestion on</p>
Q19	Mrs Jane Porter [5898]		<p>No I do not agree. Plans were submitted before a few years ago for this land and it was rejected due to the inadequate infrastructure in this area. Nothing has been added or changed so why all of a sudden is our infrastructure suitable for this piece of land? SCHOOL ROAD IS A NARROW DANGEROUS ROAD particularly as there is a Primary School right next to this. 100+ homes will generate substantial increase in school numbers and the school will not be able to expand to meet these needs, particularly after 900 homes have been build just down the road.</p>
Q19	Mrs Jane Roby [5318]		<p>Traffic is the biggest problem and will continue as more developments add traffic to Stratford Road and traffic joining via Aylesbury Road from the large development on the site of Arden School.</p> <p>A lot of cyclists use School Road daily. There is a need for road maintenance, in particular attention to potholes and to prevent the erosion of road edges and pavements.</p> <p>School pick up causes major congestion on School Road and double yellow lines just move the issue further down the road.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]		<p>List of infrastructure requirements for Hockley Heath incomplete, for both the current level of residents and settlement in the future.</p> <p>School Road requires 20mph speed limit, with volume/type of vehicles addressed through highway changes, recognising impact of development at BVP and LPR proposal.</p> <p>Significant flooding issues throughout village particularly on Stratford Road/parts of School Road. Main drains are inadequate for current load.</p> <p>Bus services have recently been reduced and no longer serve Knowle.</p> <p>Village has few facilities/convenience shops, Post Office due to close, no medical surgery/ATM.</p> <p>Inappropriate to consider school parking on opposite side of road. School is full.</p>
Q19	Mrs Julie Bourne [5815]		<p>School road is already congested at school pick up and drop off and there isn't enough parking around the school. The area can not accommodate further development on school road and the school as it stands cannot take the extra children that the development could bring.</p>
Q19	Mrs Mairead Ritchie [5446]		<p>The congestion around school drop and pick up times is just one factor. The traffic is increasing generally at all times, there is increased speeding down School Road and the village just cannot sustain further development.</p> <p>To add at least 100 houses to a small village with no chemist, doctors surgery, one small shop is causing problems. It will destroy the village nature of Hockley Heath and just attract further commuter traffic. We have a small school which will be unlikely to accommodate those numbers.</p>
Q19	Mrs Mairead Ritchie [5446]		<p>To add at least 100 houses to a small village with no chemist, doctors surgery, one small shop is causing problems. It will destroy the village nature of Hockley Heath and just attract further commuter traffic. We have a small school which will be unlikely to accommodate those numbers.</p>
Q19	Mrs Margaret Crook [6001]		<p>Congestion at the school is only part of the problem. School Road is in a dangerous condition which will get worse if more houses are built there. Blythe Valley homes will bring more traffic. Site 25 will produce more. New telephone exchange needed. Larger school required. Drainage and water supplies will require upgrade if more houses built in School Road. Doctors needed.</p>
Q19	Mrs Nicola Bishop [5692]		<p>Parking issues Drainage issue School intake issue General fear for safety with traffic volume</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Mrs Rosa Bishop [5629]		Concerns about increased traffic in Hockley Heath, particularly in the area around Hockley Heath Primary school, should the proposed housing development off School Road take place. Suggest that land adjacent to Hockley Heath school be purchased (by the developers) and used for collection and drop off of school children. Issues include: * blocking of access roads * parking on pavements and blocking access for pedestrians * Idle engines causing pollution and noise. Need a practical solution to address the issue of increased traffic around the Primary school.
Q19	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Area will not cope
Q19	Mrs Sonal Kailey [5409]		Hockley Heath is beauty small village. The area around school road should remain clear of new build due to the school being so close. The school is also at maximum capacity in my opinion and adding more spaces will be a detriment to the education our children receive.
Q19	Mrs Sonal Kailey [5409]		I agree to the funding being used to keep Hockley Heath at its best. The infrastructure plans above sounds fair.
Q19	Mrs Susan Allso [5296]		Congestion by the school will only be made worse - the provision of school parking on this site would be dangerous The school wouldn't be big enough for an influx of 100 plus houses and hasn't room to expand to two form entry. Bear in mind 750+ houses being built at Blythe Valley, a short distance from the village with no school or doctors surgery provision. Very few facilities in Hockley Heath
Q19	ms Babs Gisborne [5714]		I do not agree enough is done for the infrastructure for Hockley Heath as there is a massive building project east of Illshaw Heath, which will bring loads of additional cars to Hockley Heath from the north and the west of the A34, aggravating school parking and safety of both school access and pedestrains crossing the A34. At the moment there are issues with water pressure and in recent months there have been cuts in electricity supply to Hockley Heath residents. There is no doctor's surgery nor chemist in the village and only an hourly bus service to the nearest.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Ms Cheryl Golding [5347]		I agree there needs to be improvements, but the considerations are only concerning parking for the school along School Road. There are issues with the lay by on the bend in School Road, cars parked in front of homes frequently stick out into the traffic lane, this is dangerous as width of the road is already narrow and there have been near misses from speeding traffic. School parking issues do not apply just to School Road, living on the first home in Tutnall Drive, we have cars parked on both sides of the road, frequently blocking access into our drive.
Q19	Ms Cheryl Golding [5347]		School capacity already at a maximum, more housing = local children may not be accommodated in village school. Village facilities would be stretched, proposals for bus service reduction, no doctor/pharmacy or local businesses, means more people, more congestion.
Q19	Ms Sian Tarbuck [5406]		Hockley Heath does require protection from over development and there is too much traffic on School Road which is potentially dangerous for the school children attending the Academy. The village does not have the local amenities to cope with this additional housing Extra development will ultimately lead to more traffic and a strain on local resources.
Q19	Ms Sian Tarbuck [5406]		The village does not have the local amenities to cope with this additional housing Extra development will ultimately lead to more traffic and a strain on local resources.
Q19	Nurton Developments [5856]	Chave Planning (Ms Caroline Chave) [2678]	Nurton Developments agrees to the infrastructure requirements, has elaborated on them and how they can be dealt with. Attached to the representation is the results of a consultation with local residents regarding the development of site 25. Nurton Developments are happy to consider any further requirements raised through this consultation

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Open Spaces Society (Mr Richard Lloyd) [5451]		<p>Play and open space provision - requirements for the provision of play spaces as part of potential development sites should be extended across the Borough. standards should be established with regard to the scale of provision; nearness to dwellings; phasing within the Plan period; the type and quantity of play equipment; lighting, over-looking and physical security; the segregation of public access from ecological areas; and the process for the adoption of these areas by the Local Authority</p> <p>Master plan approach is welcomed, but should be extended to all part of the Borough. the master plans need to become more tightly defined during the further development of the Local Plan. Should show how the policies elsewhere in the Local Plan are to be implemented in each specific site. Should be clear allocation and protection of areas for public access, should be secured in perpetuity by the dedication of the land as a Village Green, or by dedication of access rights under section 16 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. There is no mention in the Draft Plan of the designation of Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF para 99</p> <p>In terms of green belt enhancements Potential improvements should be seen in the context of the agricultural use of much of the land, and of the prevailing Solihull Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2016 (ROWIP). Best possible standards and practice should be applied for the physical state of the path network. Registration of unrecorded access rights should be encouraged and expedited. The Local Plan should also define how funding derived from developers will be applied to the other aspects of enhancements to the Green Belt.</p>
Q19	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		<p>Proposals for residential site 25 in Hockley Heath is allocated within green belt land.</p> <p>No proposals given for additional places at local primary or secondary schools for children.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to main services to proposed housing, including electricity, gas, water supply, mains drainage, telecommunications.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Consider Hockley Heath is a sustainable settlement suitable for more growth than currently identified in the emerging Plan. The capacity of Hockley Heath Primary School is not clear at present, but tight boundaries of school site suggest no room to physically expand. SHELAA Site 417 could provide land for community facilities, inc. 2-form entry Primary school, sports provision and GP surgery.
Q19	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle although consideration should be given to enable the provision of a doctors surgery.
Q19	Sarah Wood [6063]		The current infrastructure in the village is lacking already and cannot sustain an increased population of 12%.Flooding is an issue on the A3400, traffic from the motorway network and cut throughs via School Road has turned these roads into mini by passes; water pressure is an issue for houses on Blackberry Avenue as well as major flooding in the fields; inadequate shops for anything but a small village; the school is over subscribed, the site lacks the room to support an additional intake. Bus services are poor and irregular and no specific medical surgeries support the village.
Q19	Severn Trent Water (Elaine Ring) [6241]		Severn Trent Water response: Results of our high level sewer capacity assessment highlights some possible risks of the proposed development on the sewerage and surface water network. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. Medium impact sites * West of Tutnall Drive, Hockley Heath * Land south of School Road
Q19	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle although consideration should be given to enable the provision of a doctor's surgery.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q19	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		Stratford-on-Avon District Council would comment that any development in Hockley Heath could impact directly on Stratford-on-Avon District in terms of for example transport infrastructure and the strategic importance of the A3400. The statement on page 38 that "Due to the proximity to the borough boundary, future expansion of the settlement within Solihull Borough is limited and largely restricted to the north and west of the village" is therefore broadly welcomed. The Council respectfully requests that SMBC engage fully with Warwickshire County Council as the relevant highway authority and with local parish councils and community groups in neighbouring areas of Stratford-on-Avon District in formulating any plans and proposals.
Q19	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle although consideration should be given to enable the provision of a doctor's surgery.
Q19	West Midlands Police (Chief Constable) [5044]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The absence of positive references to the need to provide Police infrastructure undermines the delivery of safe and secure development. There should be express reference to the need for financial contributions towards additional expenditure burden placed on WM Police as a consequence of the proposed growth. Seek engagement in preparation of Concept Masterplans and policy implementation and delivery once Plan adopted.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Hockley Heath			
Q20	Alan Pickford [6029]		<p>Access issues should be resolved before allocating for housing. School Road is a narrow two lane road, with limited footpaths. For most of day it is limited to a single carriageway due to pupil drop offs and construction traffic would add further chaos.</p> <p>Masterplan options - entrance near the school would only add to chaos particularly allowing direct access onto school road from properties fronting the road. Access to the site would be preferable opposite Tutnal Drive, where a traffic island could be constructed. This would help slow traffic/speeding down School Road Access to the A3400 is also a problem, sometimes its impossible to exit and go south</p>
Q20	Amanda Knight [5620]		<p>Site 25 is unsuitable for development because: It is green belt land where wildlife will be destroyed e.g. a heron was in the field today. This semi-rural setting will be spoiled by additional noise and light pollution It is a low lying area of land often flooded - ponies kept in the field have developed "foot rot" and had to be destroyed. School Road is a narrow lane, winding and subject to flooding. There is currently considerable parking congestion at the school. School will be overwhelmed for places. School Road traffic will increase greatly with Blythe Valley homes.</p>
Q20	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>There are no clear grounds to object on. The masterplan seems reasonable on initial inspections. Any detailed proposals will need to be reviewed with residents most closely impacted by the development.</p>
Q20	F D Muntz [6206]	Hancock Town Planning (Mr Joel Hancock) [1937]	<p>Supports the allocation of this land as an appropriate modest extension to Hockley Heath. Has a high level of accessibility being well related to the village centre and primary school.</p>
Q20	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>No objection in principle</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Hockley Heath Parish Council (Cllr Greg McDougall) [3819]		<p>NP survey showed 87% support for highway changes to School Road to prevent excessive vehicle use arising from additional Blythe Valley Park development. Finding in advance of any consultation associated with release of green belt land on School Road. Top priority for the natural environment was to protect views of Green Belt land and green spaces from inappropriate development (92%).</p> <p>69% felt that School Road should be protected from development</p> <p>Concept masterplan for the site indicates a density of housing out of proportion to the village, land unsuitable for school drop off/collection.</p> <p><i>Acknowledge site more defensible than other options</i></p>
Q20	Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms Jenny McDougall) [1921]		<p>School Road is a minor road, floods, poorly lit, experiences congestion, vehicles speed in excess of limit and residents have been concerned about children's safety for some time. SMBC Highways frequently informed by HHPC of excessive speeding.</p> <p>Large dense development proposed which is out of proportion to area and village.</p> <p>NP survey results indicate this was the top area residents stated should be protected from development and also indicated greenbelt should be preserved.</p> <p>School on opposite side to development (no footpath by site 25) so concerned of safety with crossing road.</p> <p><i>School Road will be impacted by BVP.</i></p>
Q20	Hockley Heath Residents Association (Jennie Lunt) [6020]		<p>The Hockley Heath Residents Association do not consider that site 25 should be included as an allocated site due to fundamental damage to the character of Hockley Heath and due to extensive highways issues already present in School Road.</p>
Q20	Jeff Mathieson [5504]		<p>there is no way that School road could possibly cope with any more traffic as it is already hazardous during school peak times and delays getting onto the a34. School road in the other direction is a narrow lane which would struggle to accomodate increased traffic volumes. also the local amenities are insufficient for so many more local residents. with the blythe valley development, school road will already be under much more pressure due to additional local traffic.</p>
Q20	Katrina Redmond-Lyon [5293]		<p>The draft concept masterplan seems to work well, though not knowing what type of houses are proposed it's difficult to fully comment. I am keen that new development on this site is restricted to no more than 100 houses - preferably less, no more than 50 to enable more green space left around the new houses. I would like the houses to be of a high quality such as those by Waterloo housing in HH and to include a range of sizes. Also no more than 2 story high & considerations for traffic calming on School Road.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Suitable for limited expansion as has limited facilities but including Primary School. Lower performing green belt parcel, well related to settlements with strong and defensible green belt boundaries.
Q20	Linda boyle [5885]		- Development would not address issues of congestion of School Road and would make it worse given development at Blythe valley. - Development would spoil the beauty of the area, to the detriment of current residents. Areas such as this should be maintain
Q20	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q20	Miss Davinia Fisher [5938]		Congestion
Q20	Miss Davinia Fisher [5938]		Congestion on roads, green belt land
Q20	Miss Davinia Fisher [5938]		Green belt land
Q20	Miss Deborah Bunce [5414]		Site should remain as green belt to limit future urban sprawl. School road can not accommodate more traffic This is a disproportionate increase in dwellings on one small road
Q20	Miss Katherine Beardmore [6004]		School Road is a busy road already. It simply will not cope with the amount of extra traffic. Not to mention the extra strain on local services such as the school.
Q20	Miss Krystyna McMullen [5986]		School road is too narrow and congested to cope with 100 more houses.
Q20	Mr Colin Redmond-Lyon [5294]		If more housing is to be built: (a) it is important that it is the right type of housing. (b) The windfall income from the CIL levy must be very carefully spent (and where possible matched by funding from other sources) to ensure that it is spent to improve the well being of the area and its residents both now and for future generations
Q20	Mr Dave Tarbuck [5989]		With the excessive over development of Blythe valley already putting stress on village infrastructure, there is no capacity to support more housing and the question needs posing as to why extra housing is required any way.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mr David Higgins [5621]		Green belt site in harmony with Warwickshire Green Belt across the Canal. Development will intrude on a well-defined and respected part of the village and will be out of character. The parking problems outside the school will be exacerbated. Extra traffic on School Road will lead to more accidents, especially with Blythe Valley Park traffic. Flood risk issues. Lack of key infrastructure to support current population. Non-proportional and unnecessary increase in housing which is trying to address part of Birmingham's housing needs. Traffic queues through the village are already long This, along with other local development will make it worse.
Q20	Mr David Sheppard [5456]		100 houses representing a 12% increase in the size of the settlement is not a limited and proportionate expansion. School Road and Saddlers Well Lane are inadequate. There is no exceptional reason to remove the site from the Green Belt. The site is a haven of wildlife and flora immediately adjoining the wildlife corridor of the canal. Housing would devastate the existing ecosystem as well as causing substantial light and air pollution. The Green Belt assessment fails to take into account the distinctiveness of the canal providing quiet enjoyment and pastimes to the many people who already frequent the blue network.
Q20	Mr Derek Hormel [5415]		School Road is 16ft. wide for much of its length and is already busy and dangerous. The neighbourhood plan survey conducted in 2018 showed no local support for new developments in School Road and proposed that if these were necessary they should be to the north of the road, which makes a natural boundary for the Green Belt. Surely the views of local residents who know the area should be considered in such matters.
Q20	Mr Eddie Boyle [5949]		100% NO. We do not need or want that land south of school road used to build new houses. It will destroy the wildlife that lives there. It will take away the beautiful countryside/canal walks that myself and my family love to do. It will destroy our lovely quiet village. We DONT want it.
Q20	Mr G Findlay [1904]		If you have studied the school traffic in the mornings and afternoons you will realise there isn't sufficient space for cars nor safety measures in place to keep children safe today. Extending the number of properties and therefore village population will only endanger children further.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mr Guy Thompson [5364]		<p>Site 25 is highly unsuitable due to the existing traffic congestion and overuse of this country lane. Would result in even more congestion and pollution and accidents</p> <p>The site is usually flooded.</p> <p>There are a lack of amenities and public transport for residents. (A bus stop is shown on the tow path on the map!)</p> <p>Hockley Heath has already had 3 recent developments and will become</p>
Q20	Mr John L Thomas [5355]		<p>Object to release of washed over/green belt.. School Road affected already by development in Cheswick Green/Blythe Valley/Dickens Heath, road dangerous and not suitable for more traffic. Increase in homes will result in greater difficulty with no additional access direct to A3400, build-up of traffic leaving School Road.</p> <p>Flooding an issue opposite Tutnall Drive and surrounding fields along School Road.</p> <p>School capacity already at a maximum, more housing = local children may not be accommodated in village school.</p> <p>Village facilities would be stretched, proposals for bus service reduction, no doctor/pharmacy or local businesses, means more people, more congestion.</p>
Q20	Mr John L Thomas [5355]		<p>Object to release of washed over/green belt.. School Road affected already by development in Cheswick Green/Blythe Valley/Dickens Heath, road dangerous and not suitable for more traffic. Increase in homes will result in greater difficulty with no additional access direct to A3400, build-up of traffic leaving School Road.</p> <p>Flooding an issue opposite Tutnall Drive and surrounding fields along School Road.</p> <p>School capacity already at a maximum, more housing = local children may not be accommodated in village school.</p> <p>Village facilities would be stretched, proposals for bus service reduction, no doctor/pharmacy or local businesses, means more people, more congestion.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mr John Roby [5802]		The infrastructure of the village will not cope with this level of development. 100 houses will probably mean 200 cars and as most will leave for work and return in concentrated time frames that equates to 400 car journeys plus school runs, shopping ,etc. School Road cannot cope now at peak times as anyone who has to turn right into Stratford Road will testify. Cars park at school times with a solid line without a break. There are no doctors in the village, school capacity won't cope and the whole ambience will change from that of a village.
Q20	Mr Ken Bridgwater [5912]		Site 25 should not be included. this would lead to higher volumes of traffic. School road is in urgent need of repair due to construction traffic using it as a shortcut. Congestion around the school is a hazard. no footpath around the proposed site would put children safety at risk. We do not support changes to Green Belt as this land is highly important for ecological reasons and human wellbeing. If Green Belt was released then the proposed 50 dwellings under 49 & 328 would be catastrophic for oak trees which provide essential oxygen & a haven for the wildlife
Q20	Mr Krushi Hindocha [5677]		-There aren't alternative routes to School Road - this is already extremely busy around key times and dangerous for children -100 additional dwellings will lead to a lot more than 24 additional primary school aged children - material growth to the local
Q20	Mr M Sabin [2597]		I live opposite Site 25. It is currently inhabited by various livestock, Grey Herons, Woodpeckers, and several varieties of wildfowl. I now face the prospect of facing a housing estate, additional traffic, my drive being blocked (more-so) by inconsiderate parents on the school run, potentially some form of turning circle outside my house, increased noise, air and light pollution. The road (which is both "rat-run" and a local racetrack), is too narrow to support existing traffic and parking needs. There's no Doctor or pharmacy nearby, and no regular buses. How could any right-minded individual expect my support for this development?
Q20	Mr Paul Hamilton [5683]		If the green belt land is to be allocated it also creates the potential of further development this will put strain on the local infrastructure, major works will be needed to improve utilities, traffic systems need to be installed, and added pollution levels will rise, the Blyth Valley development is surely a big enough expansion within the local area for now, why do we need to build on more Green belt land
Q20	Mr Paul Mansell [5994]		Current infrastructure is already at breaking point. No space for car parking, school is full and cannot be extended, the drainage is also an issue. The village floods at the slightest bit of rain. Adding 100 houses will not help, especially as 900 are being built around the corner at Blythe valley! The amount of green belt is what makes hockley heath so appealing to its residents. Removing that to build more houses is short sighted and greedy.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mr Paul Pendleton [6106]		School Road is a minor road and experiences congestion around the school. School Road is also prone to flooding which has not been addressed within the draft consultation documentation. The road also lacks a footpath at the location of the proposed site 25 development. The natural environment and the views of green belt land and green spaces must be protected from inappropriate development
Q20	Mr Phil Barnett [5644]		Developing here is not in line with village survey. No consideration of mitigation required in a heavily constrained part of Hockley Heath. Site not suitable due to safety issues (especially for primary school children), disruption, impact on the environment, increase in traffic congestion and the loss of rural aspects. Concept masterplan has no detail and is a desktop exercise with a full site appraisal not yet carried out. The inclusion of the site is flawed and commenting is difficult. The site has a number of established landscape features that are not represented. There is no demand for such properties.
Q20	Mr Phil Roalfe [5394]		Concerned that this number of additional houses on this site will overload local roads and infrastructure and that Green belt is being eroded.
Q20	Mr Philip Jordan [5499]		- as stated above, School Road already appears to be used beyond its design capacity and is dangerous to children and cyclists - School Road is abused by speeding traffic as a cut through from Stratford Road - the planning consent for Spitfire site spe
Q20	Mr Richard Rendle [6148]		School Road is narrow rural lane and unfit for purpose. Very limited footway provision. Existing parking problems, particularly around the school will be exacerbated. Parts of School Road are dangerous due to speeding vehicles. Flooding is an issue in the area. Additional development will exacerbate these issues. Noise and disturbance will be created throughout the build phase and ongoing noise and pollution thereafter. Lack of facilities in the village including doctors surgery and pharmacy. The infrastructure is inadequate to support additional development, including the primary school and public transport. Loss of amenity, flora, fauna, wildlife and trees.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mr Robert Bishop [5734]		<p>My objection concerns the inadequate provision of road, pavement and parking infrastructure around and leading to site 25. School Road is unfit to support the traffic using it today with significant dangerous stretches of verge void, two dangerous bends and flooding at Cheedon Farm. Sadlers Wells lane bridge has decayed to the point of potential collapse.</p> <p>The traffic impact of the Blyth valley development is unknown, but negative impact.</p> <p>Residents life is blighted at school time by chaotic parking on pavements and idling of engines.</p> <p>DCMP shows narrow roads and shared pavements, more children + more cars = Accidents</p>
Q20	Mr Sam Tarbuck [5990]		<p>If alternative travel arrangements can be made for school pick up and drop off is a very empty reason to attempt to justify additional traffic in the village.</p>
Q20	Mr Simon Geen [5975]		<p>School Road is not suitable for increased traffic flow due to a narrow blind bend near to Tysoe close, considerable congestion at school pick up and drop off times and a narrow junction with Stratford Road.</p>
Q20	Mr Steven Edgington [5981]		<p>We do not have the infrastructure for this development. The school is at capacity there are no doctors surgeries or chemists. The road is not wide enough and we have just had the Aylesbury Park and part ownership houses built on the Stratford Road as well as the extensive Blythe Valley estate (500 houses). Enough is enough, the green belt is being taken from us and Hockley Heath Village will soon become another major Town.</p>
Q20	Mr Stuart Swinton [5360]		<p>School Road is already a busy narrow road. An additional 100 homes will create <u>more congestion and safety concerns for the school</u></p>
Q20	Mr T Thomas [2538]		<p>Site 25 should not be included for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This removes most of the green belt from the village itself. 2. Additional infrastucture strain both on School Road, the school and other services in the area 3. The current plan, by the agents, for this site is for 100 houses on land which the LDP itself identifies as capable of 139 houses at least. Once green belt protection is removed there is nothing to stop either the current agent/developers or a subsequent developer from, from moving the nature area planned on site and pushing more housing through planning.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mr T Thomas [2538]		The plan removes the last green belt within the village. School Road is rural and already a serious problem for traffic and cyclists using it. Additional development together with traffic from Blythe Valley using it as a "rat run" will make it far worse. Site 25 will increase the size of Hockley Heath by 12% according to figures in this LDP. Adding the sites to the north of the road adds another 50 houses making 19% growth. With the new housing completed last year, this brings this to 25% growth in the village putting unacceptable pressure on local infrastructure.
Q20	Mr Terry Gow [5905]		There are oak trees and hedgerows which are ancient and lots of wildlife in the area, the tow path will be unusable due to flooding putting homes on the already waterlogged piece of land. The village plan indicated to not develop on School Road due to it being a dangerous road. We are a Village. Let's keep it that way
Q20	Mr Thomas Osborne [5980]		School road is a very narrow country lane already suffering from increased traffic which will only get worse with Blythe valley development. I walk School Road between Blackberry Avenue and Cut throat Lane every morning and am experiencing increased levels of pollution and speeding traffic. Additionally, the local school will be unable to cope with the inevitable increased numbers and the village infrastructure is inadequate for such an increase in housing. Green Belt should be preserved, we have two herons nesting on the canal in this section which the village would be in danger of losing.
Q20	Mr Toby Harris [5265]		I object to the development on this land due to:- -Wildlife in these fields will be impacted. -Fields are already waterlogged most of the year.
Q20	Mr Tom Porter [5422]		A drop-off area is missing the point and misleading. Traffic along School Road is the wider issue. This land will encourage more people to drive to school. The road will be used as a rat-run when housing at Blythe Valley is built out and the quality of life will be diminished for existing residents. Houses with a canalside view will be marketed at a premium which will be unaffordable for local young people. No assessment has been carried out on the overall impact of the additional 200+ cars that will use School road together with Blythe Valley Traffic and existing.
Q20	Mrs B Thomas [5785]		School Rd is too narrow. School is almost full & we have no Dr or dentist here

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mrs Joanne Jackson [5486]		The sites in question are green belt and therefore should not be used for building Safety issues for children walking to school, impact of additional traffic, flood risk and noise issues. Environmental impact and impact on wildlife. The site is green belt and should not be used for building. 12% in size of the settlement will cause terrible effects on the community. People buying these houses will be working families who will drop their kids off at school on route, they will not walk - hence the infrastructure in relation to the school will only become worse.
Q20	Mrs Alethiea De Pasquale [5678]		School rd is NOT a main road and already has a lot of congestion around the school+dangerous driving. Proposed plans for drop off point at school would still be of no use as on opposite side. It is a country lane+should be treated as such in regards to these plans. Flooding is common on School rd. Also an area rich in wildlife that will be destroyed (already at risk due to the traffic from Blythe V.) Amount of housing is out of proportion for size of the village.
Q20	Mrs Alison Hall [6005]		Hockley Heath is gradually being enclosed by new building projects. There is a need for green space in a built up area before all green becomes concrete. This land must be identified now before it is lost . Site 25 is situated in a naturally attractive area being adjacent to the canal. A natural for a wild life nature park with the possible recreation of the original pond and wetland area and if planted with a small copse and it would be an attractive feature for the village for walkers, canal users and local wildlife like frogs and moorhens.
Q20	Mrs Amanda Harris [5266]		I object to the proposed development because:- - Nature conservation. There are lots of wildlife in the fields. - Fields are heavily waterlogged already
Q20	Mrs Barbara Lawton [5737]		No, because: Over the last 2 years, at various locations within Hockley Heath, I believe approximately 120 new dwellings have been built with no extra facilities. It is green belt land that is being eroded and we are losing valuable countryside. The draining structure in the village already struggles with parts of the village flooding regularly and could not cope with any thing extra. The junction of School Road onto Stratford Road is already very dangerous, with car parks on both corners making it more difficult, additional traffic would be too much.
Q20	Mrs C Richards [5412]		Definitely removed our villages need to retain their identity not be swallowed up into large communities by over development.
Q20	Mrs Collette Higgins [6109]		We do not believe that Site 25 should be included as an allocated site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mrs Emma Gaskin-Farley [5996]		<p>The development is an unnecessary expansion of a village which has retained its character due to the Greenbelt which surrounds it.</p> <p>Should the development go ahead, School road will become more hazardous than it is presently to pedestrians & in particular children, in addition to road users around the area of Hockley Heath Academy during school drop off & collection times.</p> <p>In addition, the current infrastructure of the village is insufficient to support the addition of yet more homes.</p>
Q20	Mrs Fiona Holland [5418]		<p>Further housing compounds the existing issues of school parking/access into and out of school road outside a busy primary school. Access onto the main Stratford Road which is already troublesome.</p> <p>Wildlife and major trees should be taken into account as there regular sightings of wild monkjac deer, foxes, badgers and herons to name a few</p>
Q20	Mrs Fiona Holland [5418]		<p>This is a heavily populated area for wildlife; badgers, herons and monkjac are all seen daily.</p> <p>Mature trees, hedgerows and wild flowers are in existence. The traffic - entry and exit to School Road is already dangerous, so to is the exit to the Stratford Road</p>
Q20	Mrs Hannah Richmond [5632]		<p>No Site 25 should not be included as an allocated site.</p> <p>School Road is a minor road and experiences congestion around the school. As a local resident I can confirm there is constant concern over the speeding and congestion caused by the existing school run. To add 100 households to that traffic is crazy and will cause major problems on a daily basis.</p> <p>The land at site 25 is constantly water logged, where will the water go if 100 houses are built?</p> <p>There is dense wildlife in those fields, including muntjac and fallow deer. Building houses will remove their habitat.</p>
Q20	Mrs Jane Porter [5898]		<p>This parcel of land is full of wildlife, ancient oak trees and hedgerows none of which the Developer has represented on their master plan. The Village Plan stated that School Road would not be a suitable area for further development due to the location of the School and the narrowness of School Road. This is all prior to the Blythe Development which 900 homes will generate residents using School Road on a daily basis. This is a lucrative piece of land for any developer causing flooding for the properties around it and the wrong type of homes.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mrs Jane Roby [5318]		The exit to this development is at a point where cars park for the school. Bad drainage. Too big, especially in addition to other development in the area. 100 dwellings is too many.
Q20	Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]		Village cannot accommodate any more development. However agree that this is the best site of those put forward. Urge SMBC to really consider the limited facilities that Hockley Heath has and whether it can accommodate up to 100 new homes. Needs to be careful consideration of how school can expand and what other facilities required. Traffic implications on School Road and at Stratford Road junction. Density proposed inconsistent with village and would not safeguard natural environment. Should include more mixed development with nursery and car parking, and take more account of Parish feedback to developers at consultation event.
Q20	Mrs Jennifer Goulding [5428]		Totally unsuitable for housing development. This land is always waterlogged. Flooding in Hockley Heath is already a problem so further reduction of Green Belt would make matters worse. Very narrow bridge, Sadlers Well Lane, would be too weak for increased traffic and any widening of this pretty Lane would destroy its character.
Q20	Mrs Julie Bourne [5815]		School toad is already over built on, it wasn't designed to take the amount of cars that will be using it as it is, without the extra traffic that will be caused when building the extra houses.
Q20	Mrs Lesley Allison [6147]		Unsuitable site to build a further 100 homes. Too near to school entrance - safety issues. Traffic from School Road already uses Orchard Road as a cut through to avoid the School Road/Stratford Road junction. Houses being built in Ilshaw Heath will already cause more congestion in School Road. We can't continue to build on green belt in locations where the infrastructure and traffic conditions haven't been properly considered.
Q20	Mrs Mairead Ritchie [5446]		As previously I object strongly to Green Belt development for reasons outlined above and can see no justification for increasing congestion and pollution in order for property developers to profit.
Q20	Mrs Mairead Ritchie [5446]		Object to any development on the green belt. All development should take place on the many brownfield sites that need improving. Building here would be bad for local wildlife and diminish the quality of life for local residents. There is no shortage of housing and the kind of houses which would be built would not enable local young people to live there. No justification for increasing congestion and pollution. Adding 100 houses to a small village with few services and facilities will cause problems and will impact school capacity. Village nature will be destroyed and will attract further commuter traffic.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mrs Margaret Crook [6001]		School Road unable to cope with more traffic - it is dangerous. Loss of green space detrimental to area. No room in school. New telephone exchange will be needed - broadband at far end of School Road is appalling now. Fields provide drainage. Already difficult to get doctors appointments. Blythe Valley providing a lot of housing - more than enough for country lanes to cope with.
Q20	Mrs Naomi Courtenay [5791]		Too much effect on wildlife, environment, local pollution as the motorway is already near by.
Q20	Mrs Nicola Bishop [5692]		No ! School Road simply cannot cope with current traffic volume - it is only a matter of time until there is a fatal accident - the road is simply not wide enough or designed for this ! Flooding and drainage is an issue across the whole village but specifically at these identified sites where I have in years gone by been stranded when water has risen and not allowed any access by car !
Q20	Mrs Rachael brookes [5682]		We live on Blackberry Avenue and I fully agree that heavy congestion currently occurs in School Road. Adding 100 to 150 properties so close to the school will only make this worse. The school also cannot accommodate all of these extra houses. Already it is at full capacity and there is no room for them to expand. Our local amenities cannot support a development of this size and school road should be protected as it is currently, by green belt land.
Q20	Mrs Rosa Bishop [5629]		I have no objection to a housing development other than the potential for increased risk to both road and pedestrian users in this area.
Q20	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Area infrastructure will not cope
Q20	Mrs Sonal Kailey [5409]		Hockley Heath is a beautiful small village and will not thrive from a development that big. The school is already at capacity, with adding more children, the children who already go there will suffer academically due to more children against one teacher. I also oppose due to the building taking away the beautiful greenery we have in the village which is home to wildlife. I strongly oppose the building work.
Q20	Mrs Sonal Kailey [5409]		The build will also take away the beautiful green land which is home to wildlife and make Hockley Heath the beautiful village it is. I do not agree with this plan. The land south of school road should not be considered as allocated site.
Q20	Mrs Sonal Kailey [5409]		The land south of school road should not be considered as allocated site. That area is beautiful and green and should not be used to build on. Hockley Heath is a thriving small village. More homes would also mean pressure on the school to provide spaces. Current students will suffer as the ratio between students and teachers will increase making their education tougher

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Mrs Susan Allso [5296]		<p>My house is directly opposite site 25. I object on grounds of being overlooked/loss of privacy if developed.</p> <p>Loss of field drainage would add to flooding issues experienced recently.</p> <p>Developers would no doubt strip out every tree and hedge</p> <p>There is sufficient access to the canal without another entrance opposite my house.</p> <p>The lane was not built to accommodate an increasing amount traffic.</p>
Q20	Mrs Zoe Cooke [5716]		<p>School road already suffers from speeding cars and I don't think the school itself can cope with the increase in demand likely to be presented by this additional housing. School road is a country lane that is not designed for this amount of traffic to be coming up and down it.</p>
Q20	ms Babs Gisborne [5714]		<p>I am astounded that any Green Belt can be described as 'Lower Performance'. Green Belt is Green Belt. Once removed the ribbon of development will head along the canal as far as Illshaw Heath.</p> <p>Increasing the village by 12% will cause endless vehicle congestion with the lack of medical facilities and also overload the water, gas and electricity supplies. Where will the 200 extra cars park? Where will the potential 75-125 pupils go?</p> <p>The natural environment of trees and grasses should continue to be protected and provide the 'lungs' for the current conurbation and the health of the future generations.</p>
Q20	Ms Cheryl Golding [5347]		<p>Object to release of washed over/green belt.. School Road affected already by development in Cheswick Green/Blythe Valley/Dickens Heath, road dangerous and not suitable for more traffic. Increase in homes will result in greater difficulty with no additional access direct to A3400, build-up of traffic leaving School Road.</p> <p>Flooding an issue opposite Tutnall Drive and surrounding fields along School Road.</p>
Q20	Ms Sian Tarbuck [5406]		<p>Green belt should be protected and there is already too much traffic on School Road without adding another 100 houses. Also with the expansion of Blyth Valley and the decision to open the emergency access road then even more traffic is likely to be directed up School Risd. The village does not have the local amenities to cope with this additional housing</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Nurton Developments [5856]	Chave Planning (Ms Caroline Chave) [2678]	Nurton Developments, as site promoter, supports the proposed allocation. They have previously submitted a Vision Document (Local Plan Consultation, February 2017) to demonstrate that the site is developable and free of major constraints. - The site would deliver c100 dwellings - Location adjacent and well related to the built up area of Hockley Heath, - Site is within convenient walking distance of a range of village facilities and is located opposite the village primary school (thus offering opportunities for walking to school and minimising car travel).
Q20	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		This site should be excluded as it represents an intrusion into the openness of the Green Belt, and is remote from employment opportunities in the conurbation.
Q20	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We have no immediate concerns with the inclusion of this site, much in the same way that we consider our Client's site (reference 416) should be included if a consistent approach to assessment was taken. Fundamentally, we think Hockey Heath is a suitable location for growth and it has a role to play in meeting the Borough's overall housing requirements.
Q20	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	No immediate concerns with the inclusion of this site, SHELAA Site 417 could also be included if a consistent approach to assessment was taken. Fundamentally, we think Hockey Heath is a suitable location for growth and it has a role to play in meeting the Borough's overall housing requirements.
Q20	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Hockley Heath should be a settlement where limited and proportionate development is accepted. New development will assist with the future viability and vitality of Hockley Heath provided development is proportionate to the settlement and in the right location. However, it is considered that the site on land off Stratford Road Hockley Heath submitted as part of the Solihull DLP 2016 consultation (site 121) is located in a more central location within the settlement and exhibits equal if not better credentials in respect of Green Belt, accessibility, landscape and deliverability than Site 25 Land off School Road Hockley Heath

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q20	Sarah Wood [6063]		School Road is incapable of managing more traffic flow, either from a new development and the planned housing in BVP. The road is narrow/fast in places with blind spots; speeding /dangerous driving have been reported often. Parking by school users is a serious issue that has gone unaddressed by the Council and School for the last 12 years. I have received threats from the public when addressing poor driving and parking and have called Police. The land is host to wildlife and nature that should be protected. The development itself is out of character and disproportionate with surrounding housing.
Q20	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	Whilst proposed site has not been tested against the Accessibility Study and Green Belt Assessment, its suitability can be compared with the scoring of site 38 Ashford Manor Farm, Stratford Road given its proximity. Site 38 is considered medium/high in accessibility and lower performing parcel in terms of Green Belt with a combined score of 5. However, the Site Assessment Commentary notes that 'it would be difficult to establish a logical and defensible Green Belt boundary.' Disagree as Site 38 self contained and bound by permanent physical features.
Q20	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q20	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		Stratford- on- Avon District Council would comment that development of land south of School Road (100 dws) would be unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the District.
Q20	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	It is noted and it is agreed that Hockley Heath should be a settlement where limited and proportionate development is accepted. New development will assist with the future viability and vitality Hockley Heath provided development is proportionate to the settlement, in the right location. However, it is considered that a site in a more central location within the settlement would be preferable exhibiting equal if not better credentials in respect of Green Belt, accessibility, landscape and deliverability than Site 25 Land off School Road Hockley Heath.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Hockley Heath			
Q21	Alan Pickford [6029]		Disagrees with the stance taken by SMBC over the green belt, in particular the preservation of the Meriden Gap, they are quite happy to see the Green Belt disappear on the south side of the borough. Do we need a Hockley Heath/Henley in Arden Gap?
Q21	Amanda Knight [5620]		Green belt land should be maintained. Plenty of brown field sites exist across SMBC. HH is a semi-rural setting with limited/inadequate resources and services. Very low lying land - risk of flooding across surrounding properties and roads. Destruction of wildlife. Area will be impacted by increased noise and light pollution. School Road is narrow, winding and liable to flooding. It will be required to cope with increased traffic from Blythe Valley homes. Accessing A3400 can be difficult as often it is gridlocked from alternatives to M42 being sought. Primary School is unable to accommodate a much larger intake of children.
Q21	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		As previously stated, I am concerned by the principle of 'washed over' Green Belt. I could not find clear a clear map pertaining to the land in question. This makes me reluctant to make detailed comments on it. From the narrative explanation it sounds reasonable, but there should have been clearer visual detail in the plan.
Q21	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should site 25 be allocated then there would be no objection to the run of development along School Road being removed from the Green Belt in the interest of consistency and in line with Paragraph 361 of the SDLP 2016.
Q21	Hockley Heath Parish Council (Cllr Greg McDougall) [3819]		Don't consider there is a defensible boundary to the north of these gardens. By removing this 'washed over' Green Belt status we consider that the level of attempted development throughout this ribbon of houses and into the land behind would be inappropriate and could jeopardise the quality of the green belt surrounding Hockley Heath with no clear boundary. We don't consider that any release of the land to the South automatically suggests a revision to the boundary to the North.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Hockley Heath Parish Council (Ms Jenny McDougall) [1921]		Hockley Heath Parish Council does not support the potential changes to the Green Belt boundary and would be very concerned if the release of Site 25 (circa 100 units) also led to the release of additional 'washed over' sites with a potential further 50 dwellings being built on School Road in the future. It would have been helpful had the consultation document detailed the existing green belt boundary and the proposed new green belt boundary.
Q21	Hockley Heath Residents Association (Jennie Lunt) [6020]		We do not consider that it is appropriate to remove the washed over Green Belt from the north of School Road as we believe additional higher density development will be sought by existing home owners affected.
Q21	Jeff Mathieson [5504]		The loss of green belt in this area would be catastrophic and would change the character of the village entirely, the existing residents moved here due to the appeal of the rural nature and to add so much more development would put too much strain on the village and change its identity.
Q21	Katrina Redmond-Lyon [5293]		I would be pleased to see the removal of the 'washed over' Green belt boundary north of School Road.
Q21	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Support proposed green belt boundary which would enable Site 49 to come forward as part of land supply, but consider that Site 49 should be removed from the green belt in its own right and allocated for development. Site contributes little to green belt, is in otherwise developed area and has clear defensible boundary. Site is accessible and sustainable, notwithstanding apparent contradiction in Accessibility Study which rates Site 25 higher despite lack of footway. Site is well served by public transport and can contribute to provision for small sites.
Q21	Linda boyle [5885]		This would take away the beauty of the area! Furthermore we just don't have the resources to house all these people. Plus we have flooding issues, which would only get worst with more houses being built over grassland!
Q21	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should site 25 be allocated then there would be no objection to the run of development along School Road being removed from the Green Belt in the interest of consistency and in line with Paragraph 361 of the SDLP 2016.
Q21	Miss Davinia Fisher [5938]		Green belt land
Q21	Miss Deborah Bunce [5414]		Site should remain as green belt to limit future urban sprawl.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Miss Krystyna McMullen [5986]		The land should be protected. There is so much wildlife that depends on it. Blythe valley has just destroyed a lot of land not far from here, isn't that enough?!
Q21	Mr Colin Redmond-Lyon [5294]		The greenbelt needs to be a "green belt" around the boundaries of the community. It doesn't make sense to have green belt land which is surrounded by residential housing and so the green belt should be moved back to the natural boundary of the area.
Q21	Mr Dave Tarbuck [5989]		Green belt was instigated for a specific reason which was to provide a buffer between town and country. People live to Hockley Heath to experience village life and to move away from towns. Stop ignoring the people's wishes and consider people's quality of life.
Q21	Mr David Sheppard [5456]		100 houses on Site 25 plus 51 houses released by the "wash over" is a 19% increase to the size of the settlement. This ignores the fact that any developer of Site 25 will attempt to build more than 100 houses on a 6 hectare site. These proposals cannot be justified as a proportionate extension and would cause further strain on the limited and non-existent facilities in the village. Local, regional and national policies on the Green Belt would be breached. Hockley Heath is an important part of 'Urbs in Rure' and the proposals would ruin this historic countryside.
Q21	Mr Eddie Boyle [5949]		As with the other questions NO. WE DONT WANT ANY DEVELOPMENT. We dont want it or need it. Blythe valley is already being built upon and extending over towards school road. Hockley heath, Blythe valley, shirley, monkspath will end up being connected as 1 huge area. We dont want or need it
Q21	Mr G Findlay [1904]		A dangerous precedent. Green belt land should be respected and all green belt land provides a valued environmental aspect whatever the location
Q21	Mr Guy Thompson [5364]		Green belt land needs to be kept as green belt land. We need to keep Hockley Heath a village and maintain green spaces at all cost. No further housing developments are needed as the village does not have the amenities or infrastructure to cope.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Mr John L Thomas [5355]		<p>Object to loss of more washed over and green belt whilst there is plenty of brown-land that could be developed for housing and other development.</p> <p>Proposed sites don't take account of the congestion and flooding that is already prevalent along School Road.</p> <p>Loss of uniqueness of village with additional development on greenbelt that should be preserved.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife, winter visiting birds and natural habitat in the area, already seen total decimation in toad and frog population that was previously in place around the school.</p> <p>Amount of housing proposed for washedover/greenbelt is out of context with size of village/area.</p>
Q21	Mr John Roby [5802]		<p>The whole feel of the village will change. There will be solid housing from the Stratford Road up to No.142. The openness provided by green belt will be lost. Traffic will be increased again with all the inherent problems.</p>
Q21	Mr Ken Bridgwater [5912]		<p>We do not support changes to Green Belt as School Road is a natural haven for woodpeckers, owls, sparrows etc. Oak trees with TPOs on 49 & 328 provide essential habitat plus produce oxygen and soak up excessive ground moisture as this area is subject to localised flooding. The public footpath allows villagers to access much needed wildlife habitat to maintain society's education of the importance of preserving Green land. Changes to Green Belt for planning would be ecologically catastrophic and upset the balance of human & natural worlds.</p>
Q21	Mr Krushi Hindocha [5677]		<p>This area should equally be protected - building on this site would add yet more traffic and strain on the local infrastructure</p>
Q21	Mr M Sabin [2597]		<p>The reallocation of Green Belt land for housing development is a sacrifice of our countryside and our grandchildren's heritage for the sake of cost avoidance and financial gain for the developers.</p>
Q21	Mr Matt Barran [5408]		<p>Green belt land is of growing importance, especially in Hockley Heath where the area regularly floods after heavy rain or snow.</p>
Q21	Mr Paul Hamilton [5683]		<p>The balance in my opinion is that with the large development being built so local to the proposed site what is the need to cram so many more houses into the village? Keeping and protecting the green belt land in the most important thing</p>
Q21	Mr Paul Mansell [5994]		<p>The green belt spaces within the village is what makes the village and what makes it attractive to its residents. All you are doing is destroying it for greed and nothing else. Stop being so selfish and think of the people who already live in and care for the area</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Mr Paul Pendleton [6106]		The green belt offers home to wildlife and is a key characteristic of the village. It's residents opt for the location because of this, not in spite of it. Removing the green belt harms wildlife, increases congestion and noise pollution
Q21	Mr Phil Barnett [5644]		Washed Over Green belt is not valid due to Site 25. The proposed sites of 49 and 328 which are proposed to be released have no protective boundary to the sites determined as being RED (Sites 13, 121, 120, 417, 38, 180).
Q21	Mr Phil Roalfe [5394]		Do not wish to see any Green Belt erosion
Q21	Mr Philip Jordan [5499]		the proposed sites are in Green Belt and the local MP Caroline Spelman is fully supportive of preserving the Green Belt, and was democratically elected by the <u>local population in that knowledge</u>
Q21	Mr Richard Rendle [6148]		School Road is narrow rural lane and unfit for purpose. Very limited footway provision. Existing parking problems, particularly around the school will be exacerbated. Parts of School Road are dangerous due to speeding vehicles. Flooding is an issue in the area. Additional development will exacerbate these issues. Noise and disturbance will be created throughout the build phase and ongoing noise and pollution thereafter. Lack of facilities in the village including doctors surgery and pharmacy. The infrastructure is inadequate to support additional development, including the primary school and public transport. Loss of amenity, flora, fauna, wildlife and trees.
Q21	Mr Robert Bishop [5734]		Do not understand the question.
Q21	Mr Sam Tarbuck [5990]		This would leave the village vulnerable to more builds in the future. Another way to attempt to justify ruining green space valued by the village and its residents.
Q21	Mr Simon Geen [5975]		School road is not suitable for a large increase in traffic. There is considerable congestion and limited parking at school pick up and drop off times, there is a narrow blind bend near the entrance to Tysoe close and the junction with Stratford road can be difficult to exit at busy times.
Q21	Mr Stephen Batchelor [5413]		Preserve the Green Belt. the survey of Hockley Heath residents in preparation for the local plan demonstrated that concern for the green belt was a major consideration, with around 90% siting this as their first priority.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Mr Steven Edgington [5981]		We do not have the infrastructure for this development. The school is at capacity there are no doctors surgeries or chemists. The road is not wide enough and we have just had the Aylesbury Park and part ownership houses built on the Stratford Road as well as the extensive Blythe Valley estate (500 houses). Enough is enough, the green belt is being taken from us and Hockley Heath Village will soon become another major Town.
Q21	Mr Stuart Swinton [5360]		Removal of greenbelt north of school road opens up the prospect of numerous developments along this stretch Will affect the character and attractiveness of area Involve demolition of existing houses
Q21	Mr T Thomas [2538]		Current proposed green belt changes take too much green belt land and do NOT provide a defensible boundary against further erosion. Will open up development opportunities not only for the two current sites planned but other properties as far as 116 School Road. If site 25 is to be adopted then the green belt boundary should exclude the nature area planned to prevent future development and run back on School Road to join the current boundary by Tutnall Drive.
Q21	Mr T Thomas [2538]		The plan removes the last green belt within the village. School Road is rural and already a serious problem for traffic and cyclists using it. Additional development together with traffic from Blythe Valley using it as a "rat run" will make it far worse. Site 25 will increase the size of Hockley Heath by 12% according to figures in this LDP. Adding the sites to the north of the road adds another 50 houses making 19% growth. With the new housing completed last year, this brings this to 25% growth in the village putting unacceptable pressure on local infrastructure.
Q21	Mr Terry Gow [5905]		Greenbelt land should remain. All brown fields should be developed before this. Village plan indicated land by Stratford Road would be preferable? Maybe a larger development with infrastructure funds would be better. We don't have the space, school, doctors etc in Hockley Heath. Using the land opposite the school is crazy, with young children crossing the road, the developers car park on this land would have to be for 70 plus cars spaces but it's the wrong side of the road anyway!
Q21	Mr Toby Harris [5265]		There are plenty of brownfield sites in Solihull to build homes on. Building on the last remaining greenbelt will ruin the rural village feel of Hockley Heath.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Mr Tom Porter [5422]		<p>This development will be to the detriment of the local people but I am sure the developer will be able to market the houses at a premium as many have a canal side view! Who will benefit here?</p> <p>Local Young people = NO because they will not be able to afford them . Answer is Wealthy individuals who can pay the prices for these homes . Has any assessment been carried out on the overall impact of the additional 200+ cars that will use School road together with Blythe Valley Traffic and existing? The answer is No I strongly Object</p>
Q21	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Unreasonable and unjustified to limit this re-assessment of Green Belt boundary to north of School Lane. Given the new development in north, the same 'washed over' Green Belt assessment should be carried out south of Hockley Heath along Stratford Road. Site 14 does not have open character and green belt lower performing in GBA. Immediately adjacent development, represents natural extension of village, and part of built area as recognised in BLR assessment. Much of site previously developed, has defensible boundaries, is in sustainable location and will contribute to provision from small sites. Parish NDP Survey indicates greater community support likely.</p>
Q21	Mrs B Thomas [5785]		<p>School Rd is too narrow. School is almost full & we have no Dr or dentist here</p>
Q21	Mrs Joanne Jackson [5486]		<p>I do not believe that Green Belt should be used for 100 houses, whilst there are houses on the other side of the road this cannot be used as a Ribbon of development. The houses located on School Road are large detached plots, with large gardens to front and rear, therefore not being looked over by any other houses.</p>
Q21	Mrs Alethiea De Pasquale [5678]		<p>very concerned if the release of Site 25 (approx. 100 units) also led to the release of additional 'washed over' sites with a potential further 50 dwellings being built on School Road in the future. It would have been helpful had the consultation document detailed the existing green belt boundary and the proposed new green belt boundary. We really should be ensuring we protect our green belt areas for the environment</p>
Q21	Mrs Amanda Harris [5266]		<p>There are plenty of brownfield sites in Solihull to build on. It would ruin the feel of the village being rural.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Mrs Barbara Lawton [5737]		The village has already had approximately 120 houses built recently. The road infrastructure could not cope with any more additional dwellings, we will already be having extra traffic from the new Blythe Valley travelling through the village on roads which are already unsuitable and heavily used. The drainage is already struggling causing the drains to back up and flood in various places regularly. i believe the countryside and wildlife should be protected under the greenbelt and i therefore would not like to see this application go ahead.
Q21	Mrs C Richards [5412]		Brownfield sites closer to city centres should be used first. Building on Green Belt is causing more problems ie: more vehicles- most houses have at least 2 vehicles which will add more congestion/pollution to our roads as public transport is not reliable or regular in rural areas.Changes in water tables causing flooding. Plenty of disused factory/office buildings available for conversion or rebuilding.
Q21	Mrs C Richards [5412]		we need green belt to define our villages. Green belt is there for a reason and should be kept so. I chose to live in a rural village for a better lifestyle and green belt is part of that reason. Once built on Green belt is gone forever we need to preserve our green areas. Brownfield sites closer to city centres should be used first. Building on Green Belt is causing more problems ie: more vehicles. Plenty of disused factory/office buildings available for conversion or rebuilding.
Q21	Mrs Collette Higgins [6109]		No.
Q21	Mrs Emma Gaskin-Farley [5996]		The Greenbelt surrounding Hockley Heath is what gives the village its natural beauty & character. It is home to considerable flora, fauna & wildlife ... enjoyed by locals & visitors alike! Greenbelt should remain exactly that & the boundary should not be moved. It is why many of us bought our homes here in the first place!
Q21	Mrs Fiona Holland [5418]		This area is another area populated with wildlife and fauna. Removal of "washed over " Green Belt very unrealistic - given the lack of infrastructure in the village

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Mrs Hannah Richmond [5632]		<p>What is the point in having green belt land if the council can remove the status for houses?</p> <p>No I do not support the potential changes to the Green Belt boundary and would be very concerned if the release of Site 25 (circa 100 units) also led to the release of additional 'washed over' sites with a potential further 50 dwellings being built on School Road in the future. It would have been helpful had the consultation document detailed the existing green belt boundary and the proposed new green belt boundary.</p>
Q21	Mrs Jane Porter [5898]		<p>I strongly object to Green Belt land being used. Our Village Plan indicated land off the Stratford Road towards Box Trees Road, not School Road. We as a Borough should be using all Brown Field sites before any greenbelt land is touched. The omission of the red sites on the plan seems a unsuitable decision as if SMBC have to build then why no build near a major truck road A3400? Building a larger development means local infrastructure will funded by developers and this meets the needs of the village.</p>
Q21	Mrs Jane Roby [5318]		<p>What exactly do you mean by 'washed over' green belt? The present agricultural land is a feature of the village which I would not like to see lost to housing. The fields in question are extremely wet and any building would require significant drainage</p>
Q21	Mrs Jennie Lunt [3868]		<p>I strongly object to any change to the green belt boundary to the north of School Road. Washed over or otherwise. There is no defensible boundary to the north of these gardens. Would permit level of development throughout this ribbon of houses and into the land behind that would be inappropriate and could jeopardise the quality of the green belt surrounding Hockley Heath with no clear boundary. Release of land to south does not justify changes on north side of School Road.</p>
Q21	Mrs Julie Bourne [5815]		<p>Leave green belt as is.</p>
Q21	Mrs Margaret Crook [6001]		<p>Hockley Heath is a village. The area needs green spaces. Loss of greenbelt will mean continuous housing. The canal will no longer be a rural retreat for cyclists, walkers and boaters. The fields are also used for horses. Loss of trees and hedges are not good for the environment. Blythe Valley has already removed a large area of open land</p>
Q21	Mrs Naomi Courtenay [5791]		<p>The field is part of the Green belt. There are Oak trees and wildlife living in this area. It keeps Hockley Heath a county village. With the massive development at Blythe this is enough alteration of the local area. The field is not big enough to meet your targets so it should be left as a place for the wildlife/flora and fauna or the local area. There are owls, bees, foxes and badgers that live around the field. Also a woodpecker. What about these poor creatures?</p> <p>Impact on wildlife, environment, local pollution as the motorway is already near by.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Mrs Nicola Bishop [5692]		The current Blythe Valley development is already having an impact to HH and Cheswick Green there is now clearly more volume of traffic , longer waiting times and juctions on barrow country lanes in peak times and as a runner the air quality is massively compromised ! As a resident who has lived for decades in these areas it is frightening to sop how much pressure is on the existing road infrastructure. Environmentally sure Solihull council is concerned as this needs to be addressed ?
Q21	Mrs Sonal Kailey [5409]		Hockley Heath will not benefit from changing the boundary. This is just a way to get more houses in. Hockley Heath does not need more houses.
Q21	Mrs Susan Allso [5296]		Releasing green belt would release land for more housing in addition to site 25 Presumably removing green belt wash over could also lead to back garden development or knocking down of larger houses to build several smaller ones.
Q21	ms Babs Gisborne [5714]		Green Belt should not be washed over. It should continue to provide a barrier between the village of Hockley Heath and the countryside. Expanding the housing in an area lacking in facilities will congest the roads, exacerbate the household supplies, overcrowd the school, increase youth crime and attract more crime. Housing can be encouraged within the boundaries of the settlement and not encroach in Green Belt nor change the nature of Green Belt land. It will also give easy access to the minimal public transport system and not overpopulate a small friendly community, nor change the nature of Hockley Heath.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Ms Cheryl Golding [5347]		<p>Object to loss of more washed over and green belt whilst there is plenty of brown-land that could be developed for housing and other development.</p> <p>Proposed sites don't take account of the congestion and flooding that is already prevalent along School Road.</p> <p>Loss of uniqueness of village with additional development on greenbelt that should be preserved.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife, winter visiting birds and natural habitat in the area, already seen total decimation in toad and frog population that was previously in place around the school.</p> <p>Amount of housing proposed for washedover/greenbelt is out of context with size of village/area.</p>
Q21	Ms Sian Tarbuck [5406]		The green belt should be protected. People live in Hockley Heath to benefit from its green open spaces which planners seem determined to build on.
Q21	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We raise no issue with the amended Green Belt boundary, but we use this to highlight the similar justification for the removal of our Client's site from the Green Belt given the adjacent ribbon development, the defensible boundaries and the poor contribution it makes to the purposes of the Green Belt. As we note elsewhere in this response, we consider exceptional circumstances exist to justify this
Q21	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We raise no issue with the amended Green Belt boundary, but we use this to highlight the similar justification for the removal of our Client's site (reference 416) from the Green Belt given the adjacent ribbon development, the defensible boundaries and the poor contribution it makes to the purposes of the Green Belt.
Q21	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Raise no issue with the amended Green Belt boundary, but we use this to highlight the similar justification for the removal of SHELAA Site 417 from the Green Belt given the potential creation of strong, defensible boundaries and the poor contribution it makes to the purposes of the Green Belt.
Q21	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should site 25 be allocated then there would be no objection to the run of development along School Road being removed from the Green Belt in the interest of consistency and in line with Paragraph 361 of the SDLP 2016.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q21	Sarah Wood [6063]		<p>I do not support any changes to Green Belt land in the village as these changes clearly allow this sort of proposed change to go under the radar and increase the likelihood of such things happening in the future.</p> <p>The land in School Road is green belt and should be left as it is. There are plenty of areas of land elsewhere that are not in this category and these should be further explored.</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity over what you are also proposing in terms of change.</p>
Q21	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should site 25 be allocated then there would be no objection to the run of development along School Road being removed from the Green Belt in the interest of consistency and in line with Paragraph 361 of the SDLP 2016
Q21	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should site 25 be allocated then there would be no objection to the run of development along School Road being removed from the Green Belt in the interest of consistency and in line with Paragraph 361 of the SDLP 2016.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath			
Q22	Catherine Silcock [5529]		Improved public transport would be a bonus especially as the frequency of the buses has just been halved in the past two weeks causing issues to school children and the elderly.
Q22	Catherine Silcock [5529]		Local infrastructure is already at breaking point with the local community not being able to access doctors or dentist appointments in a suitable time frame, and the hospital losing services. With a proposed 11% population increase will we see another medical centre opening.
Q22	Catherine Silcock [5529]		Question whether new primary school will be in addition to the current four. Concern that a new secondary school will lead to smaller catchment area and affect existing households on peripheries of the settlement. Improved public transport would be a bonus especially as the frequency of the buses has recently been halved causing issues to school children and the elderly. Local infrastructure is already at breaking point with the local community unable to access doctors or dentist appointments in a suitable timeframe, and the hospital losing services. With a proposed 11% population increase will we see another medical centre opening?
Q22	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Support growth as means to address affordable housing needs of area, which should take a larger share of housing. This could offset reductions in other areas where there are greater constraints, and provide a more proportionate distribution. Development near to Dorridge Station should be prioritised strategically as a sustainable travel location. Defensible boundaries exist
Q22	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		Whilst I do understand the infrastructure requirements for Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath, I do also note the absence of any plans to provide social housing in this area. There are less than 10,000 social housing units in the Borough, most are in the 4 of the Northern Wards (3 being the Regen wars), Shirley and Elmdon. For inclusive growth and community cohesion across the Borough, it must be considered to spread the social housing stock across the whole of Solihull.
Q22	David Knowles [3742]		Additional road construction to accommodate increased traffic demand does not work - more cars use the new capacity and so that it fills up too! A bypass is not wanted. Traffic calming measures and public transport options are preferred. Better to have development restricted to the West of KDBH so no further burden is placed on the Knowle High Street.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	David Sharpe [4444]		<p>this section notes that highway improvements are likely at various locations. However this draft Plan fails to identify what improvements are likely or where. Such improvements may themselves have significant local impacts/land issues etc. and need to be identified and assessed as part of the site selection process and not just left for later assessment and consideration when sites may already have been taken forward.</p> <p>Traffic, road improvements and infrastructure improvements etc are an essential part of a sites potential for development and need to be assessed at the early stage of site selection</p>
Q22	Dr Linda Parsons [3849]		<p>These suggestions for infrastructure, whilst laudable, are paving a way for overdevelopment of the area in particular Knowle.</p> <p>Knowle would be destroyed by more development. The character of the village is paramount. It will not survive an influx of 2000 more people let alone all their cars.</p> <p>Why does Hampton in Arden have the statement that it should be protected from excessive development to protect its character when Knowle does not? Knowle should and deserves to have the same protection.</p>
Q22	Dr David Gentle [5915]		<p>Dispute that KDBH is 'well placed to accommodate growth'.</p> <p>Parking is insufficient with little scope for expansion.</p> <p>Key roads are heavily congested during commuter times - the relief road would have helped.</p> <p>The area is not 'well served' by health facilities.</p> <p>Agree that affordable housing should primarily be for local young people and older residents favouring independence.</p> <p>When considering 'a balance between character and efficiency' it must be borne in mind that 'character', contributing to the long-term quality of life for residents, should usually have priority over 'efficiency', that may link to profit.</p>
Q22	Dr Lucy Hillman [6184]		<p>The proposal to build 600-1000 homes in the Knowle and Dorridge area will affect greatly the nature of the villages. The infrastructure is not there, extra traffic through Knowle high street will ruin the nature of historic Knowle, the roads are already very busy, the schools full, the GPs surgery unable to meet local demands already. The infrastructure is not there to support the proposal. The fact that green belt land is being used is alarming when there are other much better suited areas to take this development closer to Solihull where there is better and more infrastructure.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Dr Paul Rylah [5503]		Of course it would be great to have all these improvements- but there is absolutely no guarantee that any will materialise. It's exactly the same nonsense being propagated by the Arden Chief Executive, promising a new school with every facility you could ever dream of having - but with no budget certainty and a complete suspension of reality. There simply won't be a sufficient dividend from these developments to fund all these infrastructure improvements, and no one is going to prioritise swimming pools and theatres over other far more pressing infrastructure improvements. Which improvements will we get in reality?
Q22	Duchy Homes Ltd [6036]	Barton Willmore Planning (Miss Hiteshree Kundalia) [6035]	Yes, we would agree. Our Site would be able to provide much needed housing within Dorridge, which is in a highly sustainable and accessible location. Furthermore, developer contributions from this development could assist in meeting the infrastructure improvements as identified within the consultation document
Q22	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q22	Gill Corns [4448]		The whole character of Knowle & Dorridge will be irrevocably changed by the proposed number of new houses in the area. The village traffic will become gridlocked more thought needed about the area's infrastructure as stated in Section 4 of the Knowle Society Document which I attach
Q22	Gillian Griggs [3964]		The Council has identified most of the infrastructure requirements for the KDBH Area but only in vague terms with no information on how such needs can be met or consideration of whether such development will be harmful to the settlement. Concern that bus improvements will not be viable. Impacts on doctor's surgeries, pre school facilities and the capacity/parking at Dorridge Station should be included. Unclear whether new primary is replacement or new facility. Supportive of Concept Masterplans, affordable housing. The limited benefits and lack of evidence on infrastructure impacts and mitigation is a serious omission.
Q22	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	we are broadly in agreement with the infrastructure requirements identified for Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath. It is of note that our clients land at Golden End is well placed to help contribute towards many of these infrastructure requirements including the following: affordable homes and starter homes, housing for the elderly, additional parking for Knowle Primary School, potential improvements to highway junction capacity at Kenilworth Road/High Street, additional playing fields and public open space, and pedestrian links to the canal network

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Hampton Road Developments Ltd [4643]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	We have reviewed the infrastructure requirements set out in paragraphs 222 - 233 and consider that this represents a reasonable list of measures that need to be addressed to support future development. A further detailed review of these requirements is anticipated at the planning application stage.
Q22	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	Heyford Developments agree with the need for Green Belt enhancements as encouraged by paragraph 138 of the NPPF. Consider this provision should be incumbent for all housing development within the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath areas for land that is to remain in the Green Belt to compensate for land that is taken up for development. Heyford Developments highlight the ability of land at Blue Lake Road, under their control, to deliver such mitigation measures in the form of a new country park proposed for the eastern part of the site, included in the Vision Document at Appendix A.
Q22	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	Paragraph 220 states that a mix of market and affordable housing, as well as smaller market homes for young people wishing to remain in the area and specialist housing to meet the needs of older people will provided in the settlement. As can be seen within Appendix 3 there is the potential to provide extra care housing within the Site, as required, to benefit the area
Q22	Janet Royle [4227]		As was clear from the recent consultation meeting at Arden Academy, road infrastructure has not been fully addressed. Presently Station Road, Warwick Road into the Village and along the High Street frequently become congested with long queues forming. This happens regularly in the day - at School drop off in the mornings and in the evening at the start of the evening rush hour. This is before the additional 600+ homes with associated cars. Parking in the village carparks is presently not working, likely costing more than it achieves in revenue. Unclear how this will work with even more cars.
Q22	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	Support the detailed assessment as to what is required for the settlement for the future since underpinning the Draft Local Plan Supplementary Consultation is an anticipation that KDBH will make a major contribution to accommodating not only the Borough

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Kim Hulse [5987]		<p>I support the levy and some of the improvements to the area, but all the proposed changes and volume of housing affects the very nature and community of Knowle.</p> <p>I don't think the highway improvements are enough. I think the volume of traffic in the area, particular the main routes in and out will be significantly worse. It;s hard enough to cross certain roads safely now.</p> <p>I don't think there are enough benefits to the community outlined above to pay for the volume of development (of course some is welcome)</p>
Q22	Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]		<p>The Council has identified most of the infrastructure requirements for the KDBH Area - but only in vague terms with no information on how such needs can be met or consideration of whether such development will be harmful to the settlement. Impacts on doctor's surgeries, pre school facilities and the capacity of Dorridge Station should be included. The lack of evidence on infrastructure impacts and mitigation is a serious omission.</p>
Q22	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	<p>It is agreed that the infrastructure requirements set out are appropriate.</p>
Q22	Lauren Reilly [4980]		<p>We cannot keep building new homes without improving the local amenities. Schools being one of the biggest concerns.</p>
Q22	Linda Page [4974]		<p>I would like to see a new secondary school as well as a primary school on the plan. This should involve moving the school to a new site to reduce impact on learning. Traffic is busy at pinch points and can be improved by more double yellows, traffic lights and traffic calming measures. eg. speed bumps and yellow lines on Lodge road which is a rat run. Building a new school will also reduce traffic at pick up and drop ff times.</p>
Q22	Liz Moloney [4564]		<p>Relocate Catholic Primary St George & St Teresa</p> <p>There are four new primary schools proposed in plan for this school's catchment. Demonstrate proportionality and common sense. Why not expand one of the most successful school's in the Borough - no faith cap as not new school</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Lucy Shepherd [5792]		Better public transport needed. Any increase in traffic through the High Street is concern due to pollution, potential damage to historic buildings. Re site 9, unclear how additional traffic will be accommodated. New primary school and affordable housing are needed but not at expense of all greenbelt flagged in site 9 -must there be so much new housing in Knowle on greenbelt as opposed to elsewhere? Loss of natural habitat is major concern. Prefer redeveloping Knowle precinct as brownfield mixed use site (similar to Sainsburys in Dorridge) given so many vacant units. This would reduce need for building on greenbelt.
Q22	M Lopez [6014]		I do not believe enough consideration has been made in relation to services that need to be provided to all residents in this area. In particular, doctors & medical services and facilities for young people - they do not just go to green spaces and there isn't enough affordable facilities where they can go to locally to do activities or 'hang out' with friends. Parking in Dorridge and Knowle on the roads has increased considerably due to the Dorridge train station. Consideration should be made to affordable parking in relation to any increase in parking facilities.
Q22	Mel Starling [4325]		Young families do not use public transport to get to school or go shopping - inconvenient and expensive. The majority of parents use their cars Parking at Dorridge and Widney Manor stations is at saturation point. Hampton road is a dangerous road. New additional Primary school is a necessity. New secondary school is not a necessity New football pitches will not be used/maintained
Q22	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q22	Miss Hannah Fitzgerald [5553]		If this is implemented KDBH will lose its character Traffic problems will become even worse Drive people to sell and move on Desired location at the moment, this proposal would have the opposite effect Crime would go up Not enough facilities or space for more houses Other more appropriate sites in places such as Hockley Heath, Shirley and Cheswick Green where there is more space

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mr Russell Blake [6189]		<p>I support the comments of the KDBH forum neighbourhood plan response.</p> <p>In addition personally I believe that there is not enough detail provided here regarding the scope and impact of these infrastructure requirements to meet the suggested housing need in Knowle and surrounding area.</p> <p>Why has the spatial strategy of the Council not been updated at the same time as this review. As it may address impact questions.</p> <p>I am also concerned that no weight is given here to the impact which the anticipated infrastructure changes will have for example on planning considerations for green belt and heritage / conservation.</p>
Q22	Mr Adrian Baker [3433]		<p>The proposal for circa 1100 new homes in Knowle & Dorridge is excessive and far more than 'other' area this will totally overwhelm the two villages. I believe the local infrastructure will not cope and seriously impact on the the character of Knowle. This plan does not address the infrastructure issues sufficiently and is far too many houses for our area to absorb as concluded in 'Knowle Society Document' which I agree with and have attached</p>
Q22	Mr Adrian McNicholas [5403]		<p>I do not believe the building of homes in Knowle on Hampton Road leading to Wychwood Av is the best location. This will increase traffic at the already congested Hampton/Warwick Rd intersection, and then create a 'rabbit run' through the estate road (Arden Vale).</p> <p>Furthermore creating a 'Sports Hub' beside the proposed site will also increase traffic, as this is not on a public bus/rail route, hence any visitors will need to drive to the location.</p>
Q22	Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]		<p>There is no evidence that quantifies the likely pressure on existing infrastructure and whether such pressure can be satisfactorily mitigated.</p>
Q22	Mr Andrew Moore [5979]		<p>The absence of any detailed reports on the roads and congestion that will be generated by over development of the area known as the Arden triangle is of grave concern. Knowle is a conservation area and after the A41 was downgraded (now the A4177) when the M40 opened traffic decreased.</p> <p>Now with the proposal of 2 new schools and circa 1200 new homes planned in the Arden Triangle with no plan or data whatsoever for the increased traffic seems absurd and negligent. Knowle High Street can barely cope with current traffic levels let alone the over development planned.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mr Antony Stonehewer [5729]		I do not agree with the requirement of a new primary school the current schools are accepting children from outside the catchment area son there should be sufficient space in existing school one option is to ensure St George's and Theresa school takes children from all religious back rounds
Q22	Mr Bob Holtham [3530]		I object to the proposed allocation of further development in Knowle and in particular land in the south of the Arden Triangle which will result in overloading Highways and other infrastructure. The suggestions in this section are superficial and lack any evidence based proposals to overcome them. 'Decking the car park at Dorridge Station' demonstrates the lack of thinking and does not constitute anything like a comprehensive solution. The concept Masterplans are a 'nice to have' but what weight will they be given as they lack specific detail particularly on highways improvements and traffic management.
Q22	Mr Brian Hillman [6003]		The local plan does not identify the various pinch points in the infrastructure which are obvious to local residents i.e. Knowle High Street, Warwick and Grove Road.
Q22	Mr Christopher Price [5650]		What about secondary school places and health requirements. A new health centre.
Q22	Mr David Lloyd [3278]		Development is not in keeping with the character of the area and will be excessive.
Q22	Mr David Pickering [3400]		The existing road infrastructure in and through Knowle is stretched to the limit at present, with major congestion at peak times. Adding further residential development to Knowle could result in complete gridlock at busy times, given the narrow High Street, and the dense network of junctions at Hampton Road / Lodge Road and Station Road / Kenilworth / Wilsons Road. Enhancements to encourage use of cycling (especially dedicated cycle lanes) and public transport would be welcome, but car use would inevitably increase, to the detriment of the quality of life of Knowle residents.
Q22	Mr David Power [5941]		I feel 1100 new homes in Knowle & Dorridge is excessive and will spoil the character of the two villages. The existing infrastructure will not cope and the feel of Knowle will be lost. The Plan does not address parking, schools and doctors etc. I agree with section 4 of Knowle Society Document

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mr David Roberts [2570]		<p>No. Arden School has 1500 places in 1-5th years and at capacity, can't take 1800. No new capacity envisaged. Inadequate schooling at junior/infant levels. Doctors overwhelmed. Station car parking cannot cope. No plans to alleviate problems. Public transport not properly assessed.</p> <p>3 exits onto Warwick road from proposed Arden Triangle development will not relieve Station Road and is unrealistic. A41 busiest trunk road through a village in country. Overdevelopment of Knowle with Hampton Road will create enormous rush hour traffic jams without extra from new developments.</p> <p>No assessment of extra load on M42 exacerbated by Arden Cross and HS2.</p>
Q22	Mr Don Grantham [5489]		<p>The proposal for circa 1100 new homes in Knowle & Dorridge is absolutely excessive and will destroy the character of the villages. Current infrastructure is insufficient for the planned future demands, and will not cope, causing huge issues. The historic nature and traditional character of Knowle will be destroyed completely. The Plan does not at all address the infrastructure issues. I would point you to refer to Sec 4 of Knowle Society Document with which I completely agree.</p>
Q22	Mr Duncan Powell [4603]		<p>The focus of Primary School provision on the Arden Triangle site should be Catholic, to extend the current outstanding provision of St George and St Teresa, to ensure parity in the provision of places (which has been lacking recently) and to be consistent with the earlier draft of the plan.</p>
Q22	Mr Frank Arnold [6149]		<p>Traffic and parking is already a growing issue. Other infrastructure issues like schooling and access to Doctors - both of which are already overloaded. All of these issues need to be taken into account or else the whole character of Knowle could be severely damaged.</p>
Q22	Mr Gordon OConnor [6064]		<p>I repeat my response above and in particular stress that details need to be addressed and published as a priority.</p> <p>(Supports response by KDBH Neighbourhood Plan in other representations)</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mr Gordon OConnor [6064]		I support and endorse the response of the Knowle Dorridge and Bentley Heath Forum. I accept that there may be need for new development but I expect the Council to adopt the measures set out in the KDBH neighbourhood plan and in particular I require detailed proposals in relation to infrastructure of highways, transport, education and recreation to be set out before any detailed residential development is approved as all of the existing infrastructure is already overstretched . If you want Solihull to be a beautiful place to live then this must be a priority.
Q22	Mr Graham Bowskill [5247]		The local road network south of Knowle is totally inadequate to handle the proposed number of houses This coupled with a proposed additional development in Blue Lake Road of 340 houses would further exasperate the problem. Infrastructure should be assessed (capacity) before allocating the site I also fail to notice any adequate provision for Doctors/dentists or extra secondary school places
Q22	Mr Gregory Lawson [5960]		A new school is unnecessary. The road infrastructure isn't there to deal with it. The proposed new housing is on green belt and should not be allowed. The Crestwood report describes Grove Road as " a minor local road", the character of which preserves the landscape and approach to Dorridge, and whose landscape isn't suited for high density development. There are plenty of other non green belt areas in the borough which are more suitable.
Q22	Mr Gurmukh Hayre [5813]		I agree that new housing should be split.
Q22	Mr Gurmukh Hayre [5813]		I agree that new housing should be spread and not heavily concentrated on Arden Triangle.
Q22	Mr Gurmukh Hayre [5813]		If the development of housing on Arden triangle is unavoidable , I believe it is critical that a new Arden academy and primary school be built as part of these developments for the long term benefit of KDBH collectively. Important also to ensure that the infrastructure and local facilities are upgraded to cope with additional population and traffic in the community.
Q22	Mr Gurmukh Hayre [5813]		Split housing across the local area rather than concentration is critical

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mr Harvey Scriven [3790]		Need to determine what is an appropriate scale of development for the existing infrastructure. It is perverse to suggest that major development would result in increased bus services and provide better off street parking. Pressure on school places is being exacerbated by increases in pupils from outside the area - with a knock on effect of causing increased traffic congestion. Knowle has poor public transport, a narrow high street and very limited local employment.
Q22	Mr Ian Leedham [5887]		- The current infrastructure struggles to cope and there is not the space to be able to accommodate more housing or new infrastructure within the local environment. - The roads are congested and car park at Dorridge full by 6.30am. - The recent expansi
Q22	Mr John Allen [6191]		With approximately 20,000 people already living in this area, to promote a further increase in the population as an incentive to increase public transport is unbelievable, given the population density these should already be provided.
Q22	mr Kan Karan [6011]		good prospects of develomen in our area
Q22	Mr Kar Karan [6067]		I agree with infrastructure requirements to meet the demands for additional housing
Q22	mr Karan Goswami [6089]		I agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath,
Q22	Mr Ken Currran [6079]		I support the infrastructure requirements
Q22	Mr Kym Soni [6188]		Scale of development incapable of being supported satisfactorily by Kenilworth and Warwick Roads. No highway improvements could be made to cope with the additional commuter & school run traffic. Cyclists would find it risky because of parked cars. Emergency vehicles would struggle to reach vulnerable people in time. Children would be exposed to pollution from stationary traffic. Kenilworth Road is popular with walkers, who enjoy the ambience of the countryside & canal. Proven to have health benefits. Urbanisation by the proposed development would destroy that amenity.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mr M Trentham [2114]		<p>Local concerns about traffic congestion through High Street. Sensible move would be to create a new two-lane one-way system going clockwise via High Street, Station Road, and Lodge Road. Wilsons Road could be stopped up at its junction with High Street, with no parking in Kenilworth Road in order to allow free movement both ways.</p> <p>New primary school will be required. St George and St Teresa Catholic School need to demonstrate that it has suitable replacement site and build a school before the existing site can be delivered. This should be shown in the plan or the existing site deleted.</p>
Q22	Mr Mark O'Dwyer [5679]		<p>I support a new primary school on Site 9 - Arden Triangle and I support Option 2 (Arden Academy relocating to a new school site rather than remaining in its current position).</p>
Q22	Mr Mark Whitehouse [5383]		<p>Proposed development of sites 8 & 9 will put additional strain on an already overload Knowle high street inclusion of Amber site 413 would push the system to breaking point surrounding roads to Amber site 413 are rural and would not cope</p>
Q22	Mr Martin Archer [3315]		<p>I absolutely agree that further infrastructure requirements are needed but at present there is a complete lack of any proposals to deal with the likely effects of the Arden Triangle proposal or any other possible proposals to the South of Knowle and Dorridge. It is very important that these proposals are produced before moving forward.</p>
Q22	Mr Martin Murphy [3070]		<p>Totally support the infrastructure requirements</p>
Q22	Mr Matthew Bragg [3069]		<p>The infrastructure requirements are significantly understated and too generalised, further more they do not take into consideration that the proposed redevelopment is firmly sited around the village of Knowle,</p> <p>Given that the proposed land around Knowle is greenbelt citing Green Belt Enhancements is laughable</p>
Q22	Mr Michael Doble [3296]		<p>In excess of 1,000 new homes in Knowle will destroy the present village environment.</p> <p>Occupancy of the new homes will most likely be by young people, who have cars and will not use public transport. This will further increase parking problems. Major road widening will be required, not just the tinkering suggested.</p> <p>The football club is currently short of members and has failed to maintain its existing buildings and is unlikely be able to afford to run the proposed site.</p> <p>The poor agricultural land North of Knowle, either side of the M42, is a more suitable site for proposed development.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mr Roger Marshall [5339]		Infrastructure will not cope - roads are already busy I don't believe that Knowle as a village has the capacity to cope with such a large influx of residents Influx of people on the village will negatively impact the village
Q22	Mr Steve Coathup [6078]		You state that the plan provides an opportunity for KDBH, what evidence or example do you have? You refer to potential extra off road parking provision but give no indication of where this might be. Do you have any calculations of requirement? There is already great difficulty in arranging doctors appointments in the area. The 2 nearest practices are Knowle Surgery and Dorridge Surgery. Both may have to close their lists to new residents in order to maintain service levels. No account has been taken of extra traffic on Knowle High St, or the M42 junction.
Q22	Mr Tony Moon [4964]		I believe that we also need to invest in the retail sector of the village, this will ensure that its retains a central focus
Q22	Mr Ved Goswami [3079]		Agree with infrastructure requirements
Q22	Mrs Amy Fallis [6023]		I think these are appropriate.
Q22	Mrs Ruth Paige [5558]		There's no mention of how to prevent the continuing decline of Knowle high street where shops continue to close.
Q22	Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]		Please take note of KDBH Neighbourhood plan which reflects the views of the KDBH residents
Q22	Mrs Claire Carter [5572]		I support these proposals & any development on the condition significant investment in made in local infrastructure & facilities, notably schools. I also support investment in local recreational facilities. An improved bus service with electric buses to minimize air pollution & improved cycle paths to accommodate the increase in traffic. I would also like to see an investment to expand local doctors surgeries to take account of the increase in population.
Q22	Mrs Claire Gibney [5423]		I agree that Brownfield sites should be chosen in preference to Greenfield sites. The Green belt and the nature of the borough must remain protected. I support the Knowle Society point of view re this plan. I am very concerned by the volume of new housing planned for Knowle and its impact on the village: this will no longer be a village and its schools / surgeries / carparks / roads etc are already at full capacity. Are there any plans to improve the current situation, before the council adversely adds to it?

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mrs E Hedley [3516]		Infrastructure requirements have been identified in Knowle but only in very general, vague terms with no information as to how these are to be met or how harmful they will be to the village. The lack of information on transportation issues is a serious omission and addressing this only at the Submission stage wholly unsatisfactory. Sports and recreation facilities needed, but Hampton Road poorly located and larger than required. Please also see the response from the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum which I support and fully endorse.
Q22	Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [6162]		I support the representations made on behalf of KDBH Neighbourhood Forum. I am concerned about the primary school places, especially if development goes ahead on the St George and St Teresa Site. A road infrastructure plan to cover the inevitable increase in traffic levels is required. Relocation of schools does not remove traffic problems simply moves them to the south of the village and onto the existing High Street.
Q22	Mrs Faye Doble [4650]		Only Knowle, not whole area. Does not meet NPPF objectives: Economic - houses only, no provision/infrastructure for more employment in area. Social - degrades what is enjoyed by existing community. Environment - massive increase in cars needed to commute to jobs away from area will increase pollution. Parking improvements not needed as shopping online. Village commerce - restaurants/hairdressers/offices are replacing retail. Highways could not cope with extra traffic, adding pollution/frustration/discontentment. Existing sports/open spaces good/affordable within 2 miles radius. Affordable Smaller market homes are too small for active/homeworking families.
Q22	Mrs Helen Baker [5930]		1100 new homes in the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath area is excessive to say the least. The infrastructure is already challenging and the Plan does little to address the real issues. This amount of new homes will certainly ruin the character of the area.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mrs Jane Starling [3207]		<p>Won't improve public transport. Most young families have 2 cars and never use buses.</p> <p>Parking needs improving now, especially at Dorridge railway station, not when 1000 more houses are built.</p> <p>What happens if site 8 is selected instead of/before site 9 and the new primary school? Where do these children go to school?</p> <p>Proposed sports hub is dependent on football ground reallocation and existing site built upon. is this not just bribery/carrot dangling? There are no guarantees that a sports hub will materialise. The current club is certainly not welcoming to the wider public. Floodlighting would impact on surrounding houses.</p>
Q22	Mrs Jayne Wood [5646]		<p>Road infrastructure is a major concern. Already have significant traffic congestion in Knowle and surrounding area. Arden School has increased its intake from 8 to 10 forms, but only require 8 to satisfy the local community. A large number of pupils are from outside KDBH many from Birmingham postcodes. I cannot see that we require all the facilities Arden propose - we have an adequate Theatre in Solihull and plenty of gyms etc. Concerns that other schools in area will be neglected as funds will be concentrated on this ambitious plan.</p>
Q22	Mrs Jill Collins [3784]		<p>Impossible to improve highways to cope with traffic generated by developments on sites 8/9.</p> <p>There is no way of widening Knowle High Street. Bypass plan has been abandoned, but that would not alleviate congestion between Knowle and M42/Solihull, neither would a one-way system round Knowle.</p> <p>Warwick Road currently heavily congested in mornings/evenings. Add traffic from site 9 and it would be standstill. Traffic from site 8 at Hampton Road would cause gridlock.</p> <p>Proposed small primary school would not cope with children from sites 8/9 - especially if current Catholic primary school is closed and site used for even more</p>
Q22	Mrs Jill Hillman [5492]		<p>The existing infrastructure is inadequate, Warwick Road is already very busy and a fast 2 way single road into Knowle, Grove Road is no more than a lane and Knowle High Street is at grid lock at commuter times and busy during most of the day. This will cause a safety issue. The car parking is already inadequate, dr's and dentist surgeries are full to capacity and so are Nursery, Infant and Junior schools. This development would add at least 2 cars to every household (600 houses, 1200 extra cars). The demographic and historic nature of Knowle will be completely destroyed.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mrs Jill Hillman [5492]		The position of Arden Triangle between Warwick Road and Grove Road is totally unsuitable as both roads are narrow and already very busy. To have access to this proposed site in either roads, I believe Warwick road is the most favourable is adding to the already fast entrance into Knowle. The present infrastructure is completely saturated, roads, car parks, Dr's surgeries, schools, nurseries - it just mystifies residents why this location has even been identified as being feasible. Is it greedy land owners who are already clearing established wooded areas to guarantee purchase from even greedier developers. Looks like it.
Q22	Mrs Jo Guy [6168]		Given the amount of housing envisaged I do not see and indication that the impact of the palm on the provision of primary and secondary health care have been reflected in the infrastructure requirements for Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath. The increase in population is roughly equivalent to a whole GP list in Knowle alone and would also place significant pressure on hospital and community service and additional provisions to accommodate this activity will undoubtedly be required.
Q22	Mrs Julie Irvine [5982]		With the increase in older population there needs to be improved public transport to meet their needs. In addition Dorridge station needs increased parking provision to reduce the amount of on street parking which is being pushed out as far as Knowle with the added parking restrictions that are being put in place

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mrs Karen Allen [6190]		<p>I object to development in this area; infrastructure (e.g.roads/doctors) can't support it. No development on Green Belt Land. Birmingham to use brown field sites. Do not relocate Arden Academy.</p> <p>It is nonsense to say that improved public transport would be viable. If this statement were to hold true then we would already have good public transport provision, however this is not the case and public transport has recently deteriorated with the revised bus timetables. The level of income for the people in this area mean that they can afford cars. Parking at Dorridge railway station should remain free to encourage use of trains even if another deck was included. If a new Primary school is included it should be separate from Arden Academy. This area benefits from diversity in schooling and this needs to continue. This new primary school should be within local authority control.Section 106 funding should not be used to relocate Arden Academy. The section 106 money is needed for other infrastructure improvements and facilities.</p> <p>We already have a swimming pool and theatre within 4 miles and it is unlikely that the area could financially support another of each. Doctors are already oversubscribed in the area. Objects to Solihull and in particular Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath being used to provide the Wider Housing Market Area allocation; there are plenty of derelict and brown field sites in Birmingham that should be built on first and definitely before any green belt land is built on. Roads in this area are unable to accommodate additional traffic, particularly Station Road and Widney Road.</p>
Q22	Mrs Katherine Lang [5635]		Any increase in housing must ensure that doctors surgeries are improved to support that increase
Q22	Mrs Kavita Goswami [6086]		I agree with the infrastructure requirements identified for the area
Q22	Mrs L Mackay [2577]		Main concern is on the primary education of the children from the new site. The recent development resulted in the Academy having to accommodate an extra intake, 90 not 60 children. Unless the timing of the release of the land is regulated children will not be able to attend their local school as the new Primary will not be built till the later stages of the Plan's timeline. Knowle only has capacity for 30 extra children every 4th year.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Mrs Laura Dunne [3806]		Any house building would have to be accompanied by the appropriate level of infrastructure development. There is currently a shortage of appropriate parking in Knowle, it is hard to get doctors appointments, the traffic through the village at peak times can bring everything to a standstill. Speed reduction measures are not the answer - more houses will lead to more traffic, and so increased road and parking capacity needs to be provided. Would new houses fall within catchment area for Knowle Primary Academy which is already over-subscribed? Developers should be expected to contribute to expansion to accommodate additional pupils.
Q22	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		The pressures on infrastructure identified for Knowle and in particular the Arden Triangle are a result of poor site selection and an over allocation of development on all the land south of Knowle. A) it will overload the village centre and create further congestion B) It will divert local/commuter traffic to Grove Road without any specific measures identified to deal with these problems and C) It will harm the historic setting and rural approach to Knowle by consuming so much valuable landscape. The allocation be reduced significantly and alternatives found elsewhere in KDBH.
Q22	Mrs Marjorie Archer [3558]		The proposal is excessive. The current infrastructure will not cope. See Sec 4 of Knowle Society Document with which I completely agree.
Q22	Mrs Patricia Platt [5369]		Traffic problems caused by several hundred extra homes It would put pressure on doctors when it is already difficult to get an appointment
Q22	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Area infrastructure will not cope
Q22	Mrs Sarah Letters [6037]		I believe that an increase of c. 600 homes in the Knowle area will damage the character of the settlement, for the worse and will put increasing pressure on infrastructure (roads, parking etc), that will not easily be remedied. I do not believe that it is only possible to address some of these infrastructure issues if there is a higher number of residents in the area; conversely I think these matters can and should be remedied before there is such a significant increase - which is greater than the amount proposed at any of the other sites.
Q22	Ms Mali malika [6010]		I support the infrastructure requirements
Q22	Ms Malika Goswami [6088]		I support the identified infrastructure requirements
Q22	Naomi Sheard [5894]		The necessity to move Knowle football should be questioned. In order for young people to access sporting facilities they should be within the community not on the fringes.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Open Spaces Society (Mr Richard Lloyd) [5451]		<p>Play and open space provision - requirements for the provision of play spaces as part of potential development sites should be extended across the Borough. standards should be established with regard to the scale of provision; nearness to dwellings; phasing within the Plan period; the type and quantity of play equipment; lighting, over-looking and physical security; the segregation of public access from ecological areas; and the process for the adoption of these areas by the Local Authority</p> <p>Master plan approach is welcomed, but should be extended to all part of the Borough. the master plans need to become more tightly defined during the further development of the Local Plan. Should show how the policies elsewhere in the Local Plan are to be implemented in each specific site. Should be clear allocation and protection of areas for public access, should be secured in perpetuity by the dedication of the land as a Village Green, or by dedication of access rights under section 16 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. There is no mention in the Draft Plan of the designation of Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF para 99</p> <p>In terms of green belt enhancements Potential improvements should be seen in the context of the agricultural use of much of the land, and of the prevailing Solihull Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2016 (ROWIP). Best possible standards and practice should be applied for the physical state of the path network. Registration of unrecorded access rights should be encouraged and expedited. The Local Plan should also define how funding derived from developers will be applied to the other aspects of enhancements to the Green Belt.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		<p>Primary objection: Residential sites 8 & 9 in Knowle are allocated within existing green belt land.</p> <p>Draft plan for 900 additional homes increases existing population in Knowle (census 2011) by 20%.</p> <p>State funding for a new primary school should be financed through government not section 106 agreements. There is no mention of relocation of Arden School (10FE), or relocation of St George and St Teresa Catholic Primary School (1FE). There are no proposals to increase secondary places at Arden School. No consideration has been given to mains services to proposed housing, including electricity, gas, water supply, mains drainage, telecommunications.</p>
Q22	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		<p>Principle concerns are that the Arden triangle is likely to generate considerable additional traffic. The deletion of the Knowle Bypass was short sighted and should be restored to cater for the new traffic generated in the plan. Site 125 which was the old by pass route should not be released for housing but should be retained as an option route for a revived by pass. Centres of Knowle and Dorridge are already congested with little spare parking for shopping and in general. Dorridge Station has very little spare capacity. No provision for employment development is made.</p>
Q22	Roger Atkinson [5993]		<p>Much more should be done to encourage walking and cycling - which should be prioritised over car use. At the moment cycling on Warwick Road and Station Road, among others, can be a very unpleasant experience.</p> <p>Knowle and Dorridge should have a 20 mph limit in all built up areas</p>
Q22	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	Severn Trent Water (Elaine Ring) [6241]		<p>Severn Trent Water response: Results of our high level sewer capacity assessment highlights some possible risks of the proposed development on the sewerage and surface water network. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead.</p> <p>High Impact Sites in Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Medium impact sites * West of Newton Road, Knowle * St George & St Teresa Catholic Primary School * Norton Green Lane, Opposite Norton Green STW * South of Knowle * Hampton Road</p>
Q22	SOS Limited (ms anne hem) [6013]		houghfull consideraton y thbe council
Q22	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	In order to meet these ambitious infrastructure requirements in the local area, it will be necessary to allocate additional sites for development within the area.
Q22	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q22	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		It is recognised in the LPR that although KDBH do not have significant areas of employment (which could result in high levels of out-commuting) are all located in close proximity to the Strategic Highway Network. They do have a full range of facilities including both secondary & primary schools, health services and a range of shops, services and facilities and therefore is well placed to accommodate growth in excess of just its own local needs. For these reasons it is not anticipated that development here would have an adverse impact on infrastructure in Stratford on- Avon District.
Q22	Terry Corns [4446]		The proposal for circa 1100 new homes in Knowle & Dorridge is excessive and will destroy the character of the two villages. The present infrastructure will not cope and the ancient character of Knowle will be destroyed. The Plan does not address infrastructure issues sufficiently. See Sec 4 of attached Knowle Society Document with which I agree wholeheartedly.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q22	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		Vague indications of infrastructure requirements are identified but these are not definitive proposals to enable a balanced and structured response. Whilst the indicative requirements go some way towards meeting known problems, there is a lack of supportive details. Without any essential details, not even the measurable impacts at various junctions which will have to be mitigated and how this can be achieved, the consultation is defective.
Q22	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q22	West Midlands Police (Chief Constable) [5044]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The absence of positive references to the need to provide Police infrastructure undermines the delivery of safe and secure development. There should be express reference to the need for financial contributions towards additional expenditure burden placed on WM Police as a consequence of the proposed growth. Seek engagement in preparation of Concept Masterplans and policy implementation and delivery once Plan adopted.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath			
Q23	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Many sites rejected where there are no existing physical features, yet there is no clearly defined physical boundary along northern edge of NW proposal and site does not follow field boundaries. Topography means site more visually intrusive in green belt and impacts on openness. Impact on Local Wildlife Site, TPOs, right of way and setting of Grimshaw Hall.</p> <p>SE proposal occupied by Knowle FC so question over deliverability. Further land promoted with potential impacts on Grimshaw Hall. Land is highly performing in Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>No very special circumstances to justify sports hub in green belt.</p>
Q23	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Yes
Q23	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		<p>Site 8 should not be allocated in the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Proposals to surround Knowle village with extensive housing to its north (Site 8) and south (Site 9) would undermine the Conservation Area's character and setting because Knowle would become a town in terms of population size and urban extent.</p> <p>Impact on Knowle Conservation Area, most important in the Borough and other heritage assets. Would have the effect of developing open land to the north of the historic village and removing the countryside setting that remains to that side of Knowle. Turning settlement from village to more like a town.</p> <p>Loss of Green Belt</p>
Q23	Dr Linda Parsons [3849]		<p>Who says it is of medium landscape character and low visual sensitivity? No green belt should be used.</p> <p>Knowle cannot take any more intrusion. The village would be destroyed by more houses and consequently more people and cars.</p>
Q23	Dr A Jickells [2008]		<p>This is Green Belt, does not constitute rounding off and should not be built on. Knowle cannot accommodate this development especially alongside Site 9, as there are too many houses and the traffic will use the junction with Warwick Road, worsening congestion.</p> <p>Concept Masterplan</p> <p>No details of how Purnell's Brook or the Streamside Trust nature reserve would be protected, and not all protected trees and hedgerows shown.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Dr David Gentle [5915]		There is opportunity to create a comprehensive sports hub with facilities for a range of sports and fitness centre. Suitable management and operation arrangements would secure guaranteed long-term availability for the public with full and comprehensive opening hours. Such a centre or centres could be secured from the development funding for sites 8 and 9. This will enable Solihull Council to take the lead in masterminding the development of KDBH as a whole rather than the future of the area being determined by the aspirations of two organisations that may put their own development first.
Q23	Dr Paul Rylah [5503]		While I have concerns over the extra traffic and pressure on the current infrastructure (schools, GPS, parking) I believe Knowle can absorb a development of this kind, and contribute to the clear need for extra housing, of all sizes and type. It would also be a great boost to the village to gain the addition investment in sports facilities - presuming the funding materialises.
Q23	Duchy Homes Ltd [6036]	Barton Willmore Planning (Miss Hiteshree Kundalia) [6035]	Only two sites have been identified for residential development within and around Dorridge (Site 8: Hampton Road, capacity 300-350 and Site 9: Arden Triangle, capacity 600), both of which are large sites. There is no evidence provided on the deliverability of these sites, include the timescales for housing to come forward. However, smaller Sites such as our Client's, are more deliverable within the early years of the Plan. This will help to address the known affordability issues in Dorridge and the wider Borough.
Q23	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		A Main River (Purnells Brook, tributary of the River Blythe) bisects the site, however our 'Flood Map for Planning' only shows the flood risk from watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km ² , mapping of the risk from the watercourse has not been undertaken and as such this is the only reason the site is shown to lie in low risk Flood Zone 1. We strongly recommend that hydraulic modelling of the watercourse is undertaken as part of a Level 2 SFRA to inform of the developable area and capacity of this potential allocation. As a Main River, a minimum 8m easement should be provided from each bank in order to allow for essential channel maintenance. This will serve the dual purpose of protecting and maintaining green and blue infrastructure. Should you chose not to undertake modelling as part of a Level 2 SFRA, we will require modelling to be undertaken as part of a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment in support of a planning application, and development will need to be located outside Flood Zone 2 and 3, and the 100 year plus climate change flood extent. Any numbers allocated for this site will need to have sufficient flexibility to ensure they can respond to unassessed flood risk issues so that the allocation is not compromised by inability to deliver the required scale of development whilst also meeting flood risk requirements.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q23	Gillian Griggs [3964]		<p>Concept Masterplan needs to take into account:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Levels and topography issues for both housing and sports pitches which are significant and sensitive 2.Densities, as high density inappropriate on whole of eastern parcel, and western part should be medium transitioning to low 3.Public open space and structural green framework required for both parts 4.Design Coding required and should take account of levels, green infrastructure, landscape and visual impacts and floodlighting, together with transportation and heritage impacts
Q23	Gillian Griggs [3964]		<p>This allocation would be a large scale encroachment into the countryside and Green Belt extending well beyond the built limits and natural topography of Knowle. The topography and substantial changes in levels are not addressed in the masterplan. Without information on levels, infrastructure impacts (particularly highways/junction impacts/mitigation), impacts on Knowle Conservation Area and clarity on the GB and LWS boundaries, it is not possible to support this allocation and the draft concept masterplan. The issues raised by the NF Landscape Study and Masterplanning/Design and Design Coding Study need first to be addressed before any allocation can be supported.</p>
Q23	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	<p>Before allocating this site the Council must satisfy itself that the site is deliverable. The scheme (including the Cricket Club) is controlled by 4 landowners and will require re-provision of the sports facilities before any housing can take place on the football/cricket club site. There has to be a concern that delivery will take time. At best much of the housing will be delivered in the later stages of the local plan period.</p> <p>The site is not the most accessible to public transport. It must be carefully accessed for its impacts on the Grade 1 listed Grimshaw Hall.</p>
Q23	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Many sites rejected where there are no existing physical features, yet there is no clearly defined physical boundary along northern edge of NW proposal and site does not follow field boundaries. Topography means site more visually intrusive in green belt and impacts on openness. Impact on Local Wildlife Site, TPOs, right of way and setting of Grimshaw Hall.</p> <p>SE proposal occupied by Knowle FC so question over deliverability. Further land promoted with potential impacts on Grimshaw Hall. Land is highly performing in Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>No very special circumstances to justify sports hub in green belt.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Hampton Road Developments Ltd [4643]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	Support the inclusion of Hampton Road as an allocation. However, parts of the site identified as "potential area of development subject to heritage assessment" should also be included. The Council's Heritage Assessment should consider the technical work done in support of the site. Impact on the setting of Grimshaw Hall can be mitigated. Acknowledged the Council's concerns over the impact of the development on the Green Belt, in particular the visual impact of the sports facilities. Consider the inclusion of green infrastructure would provide effective mitigation. Unreasonable to describe accessibility to public transport as "currently low".
Q23	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	Heyford Developments strongly object to the inclusion of Site 8 as an allocated site, ahead of land under their control at Blue Lake Road, as: * It has been incorrectly prioritised in the Site Selection Process; * The loss of the land parcel to the north of Hampton Road facilitating the proposed new sports pitches and adjacent housing is unjustified in landscape and Green Belt terms; and * It would cause unacceptable harm to the setting of Grimshaw Hall (Grade I Listed) Land off Blue Lake Road would be less harmful and can provide appropriate mitigation for green belt loss.
Q23	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		The Grade I status of Grimshaw Hall will require due weight to be given to its conservation. Any consideration of an allocation will need to demonstrate that sufficient account is taken of the Plan's evidence base to avoid or minimise harm to the significance of the Hall. Due regard must be had to the desirability of preserving its setting. Without publication of the Council's Heritage Impact Assessment of this site, Historic England are unable to consider whether the principle of development or such a proposed response would be appropriate or effective in avoiding harm and the delivery of sustainable development.
Q23	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	this Site contains sports pitch provision which must be mitigated in line with the Revised NPPF (2019). It is also noted that this Site is in a similar location to the Site at Jacobean Lane and enjoys similar defensible boundaries. It is also within the same Green Belt parcel within the Council's Green Belt Assessment. The Council should utilise the same assessment for both sites. The allocation of Site 8 will also reinforce the canal as the edge of the settlement, which would be in line with the Site at Jacobean Lane.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Many sites rejected where there are no existing physical features, yet there is no clearly defined physical boundary along northern edge of NW proposal and site does not follow field boundaries. Topography means site more visually intrusive in green belt and impacts on openness. Impact on Local Wildlife Site, TPOs, right of way and setting of Grimshaw Hall.</p> <p>SE proposal occupied by Knowle FC so question over deliverability. Further land promoted with potential impacts on Grimshaw Hall. Land is highly performing in Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>No very special circumstances to justify sports hub in green belt.</p>
Q23	Kim Hulse [5987]		<p>The site encroaches on greenbelt and is identified as an important parcel in preventing unrestricted sprawl of urban areas.</p> <p>The Hampton Road corridor gives Knowle it's rural setting.</p> <p>There's a cultural & heritage impact on local listed buildings.</p> <p>Views from the canal would significantly impact the rural nature and be visually intrusive.</p> <p>Wildlife of Wychwood woods and canal (a proposed LWS), should remain connected.</p> <p>Footpaths are regularly by locals appreciating being connected to the countryside.</p> <p>The sports hub on higher land means lights and noise impacting residents and tranquillity.</p>
Q23	Knowle Streamside Trust (Mr Alan Rebeiro) [3467]		<p>The Committee would wish to re-iterate its concern on the impact of large scale housing in proximity to the LWS in relation to environmental and ecological issues, and to potential impact upon Purnell's Brook. The Masterplan indicates the LWS is to be treated as POS to serve the proposed development and it is not acceptable as the development must meet its own needs and not utilise already protected wildlife sites. For clarity therefore the Masterplan should exclude the existing Wychwood Avenue LWS and note the recent addition to the draft NPPF "Identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats".</p>
Q23	Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]		<p>This allocation would be a large scale encroachment into the countryside and Green Belt extending well beyond the built limits and natural topography of Knowle. The topography and substantial changes in levels are not addressed in the masterplan. Without information on levels, infrastructure impacts (particularly highways/junction impacts/mitigation), impacts on Knowle Conservation Area and clarity on the GB and LWS boundaries, it is not possible to support this allocation and the draft concept masterplan. The issues raised by the NF Landscape Study and Masterplanning/Design and Design Coding Study need first to be addressed before any allocation can be supported.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Many sites rejected where there are no existing physical features, yet there is no clearly defined physical boundary along northern edge of NW proposal and site does not follow field boundaries. Topography means site more visually intrusive in green belt and impacts on openness. Impact on Local Wildlife Site, TPOs, right of way and setting of Grimshaw Hall. SE proposal occupied by Knowle FC so question over deliverability. Further land promoted with potential impacts on Grimshaw Hall. Land is highly performing in Green Belt Assessment. No very special circumstances to justify sports hub in green belt.
Q23	Lucy Shepherd [5792]		Although I live on wychwood, I do not object to a sensible development and think the proposal of sports and recreational facilities is a good one. I am concerned that public transport is made available, public rights of way are preserved and the feeling of space is kept so the site is not overdeveloped. Buildings should be low and floodlighting should be dealt with sensitively so as not to disturb wildlife in the wychwood nature reserve. The site makes sense for development over other greenbelt areas as it was formerly used as a commercial nursery and arguably extends existing estates.
Q23	M Lopez [6014]		The new houses that are already being built seem packed in to the area, with tiny gardens - it is altering the feel of Knowle.
Q23	Mel Starling [4325]		Hampton Road is high performing greenbelt and not near any amenities This site is abuts low density high quality housing. The development will significantly affect the sky line. It rises up from Chantry Heath towards the canal. The horizon will be blurred by hundreds of houses topped off with flood lights
Q23	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q23	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Many sites rejected where there are no existing physical features, yet there is no clearly defined physical boundary along northern edge of NW proposal and site does not follow field boundaries. Topography means site more visually intrusive in green belt and impacts on openness. Impact on Local Wildlife Site, TPOs, right of way and setting of Grimshaw Hall. SE proposal occupied by Knowle FC so question over deliverability. Further land promoted with potential impacts on Grimshaw Hall. Land is highly performing in Green Belt Assessment. No very special circumstances to justify sports hub in green belt.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Many sites rejected where there are no existing physical features, yet there is no clearly defined physical boundary along northern edge of NW proposal and site does not follow field boundaries. Topography means site more visually intrusive in green belt and impacts on openness. Impact on Local Wildlife Site, TPOs, right of way and setting of Grimshaw Hall. SE proposal occupied by Knowle FC so question over deliverability. Further land promoted with potential impacts on Grimshaw Hall. Land is highly performing in Green Belt Assessment. No very special circumstances to justify sports hub in green belt.
Q23	Mr Adrian McNicholas [5403]		Grove Rd would be an improved 1st choice. As the highest location in the area, I think the new estate will become too visible.
Q23	Mr Alex Wiseman [5845]		Agree.
Q23	Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]		Site should not be included as in principle objection due to overriding importance of green belt, poorly performing in terms of Spatial Strategy/Sustainability Appraisal, categorisation questionable. Inadequate regard for countryside encroachment, landscape impacts, topographical constraints, traffic impacts including on Conservation Area, or infrastructure requirements. Green belt boundary poorly defined. Quantum of housing not justified by viability assessment. Poor accessibility. Sports development not defined or appraised for impacts, no comparative assessment of locations. Concept masterplan need strengthening to refer to important features that may need to be retained/constraints, safeguard landscape/biodiversity, secure new planting/green framework, limit extent of development, consider densities and accessibility to sports facilities.
Q23	Mr Bob Holtham [3530]		Subject to clarity on the proposed traffic management of the Warwick Road Junction that will not gridlock the flow of traffic North/South.
Q23	Mr David Lloyd [3278]		Green belt and local amenity should be protected thus development is inappropriate.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Mr David Pickering [3400]		Green belt land is precious and should be built on as a last resort only. Some of the reasons put forward for building on this particular site do not stand up to scrutiny. It is not rounding off, if red sites 214/215 represent incursion into countryside, so does site 213. Development would sandwich Purnells Brook wildlife site compromising its value Any permitted development should be mixed and not high-density, including open spaces, and sensitive to the adjacent existing housing. Any development should prioritise and facilitate cycle and bus usage and houses should be required to be highly energy efficient.
Q23	Mr Gordon OConnor [6064]		I support and endorse the response of KDBH Forum.
Q23	Mr Ian Kay [5312]		It is difficult to comment without maps, however the B93 Facebook group claims that this update of the plan includes land adjacent to Kixley Ln. If so, this would be completely unacceptable, Kixley Ln is a beautiful 14th century relic and it, along with the footpath route to the canal pedestrian bridge should be kept in agricultural use
Q23	Mr John Allen [6191]		I object to any incursion into the green belt. Part of the housing numbers needed in Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath relate to the 'Wider Market Housing Area' requirement. There are plenty of derelict land areas available in Birmingham and these should be used first to accommodate Birmingham's housing requirements before greenbelt land is built on. SMBC should make a stand on this issue.
Q23	mr Kan Karan [6011]		bad site for development
Q23	Mr Kar Karan [6067]		Site poses significant environmental & geographical challenges
Q23	Mr Ken Currran [6079]		Unsuitable site - will add congestion
Q23	Mr Kym Soni [6188]		The concentration of development in Knowle is detrimental to the green belt, and thus, the quality of life for current residents. The additional traffic and pollution (air quality and noise) would blight the lives of residents.
Q23	Mr M Trentham [2114]		Site 8 is too much of a Green Belt intrusion between Knowle and Hampton. Football club site and old Thackers nursery are acceptable, but further along Hampton Lane towards the canal is not. Amber site A5 would be a more appropriate as a replacement and would provide a sensible rounding off to the settlement
Q23	Mr Martin Murphy [3070]		It is very important that the sports facilities are part of the plan

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Mr Michael Doble [3296]		<p>The area of land to the north of Hampton Road forms part of the Meriden Gap which was specifically protected in the previous structure plan. The development of the football pitch would line up with the existing development within Hampton Road and would naturally round off development. The further encroachment of development into the former Thacker's Nursery and roadside field opposite Grimshaw Hall is not a rounding off but would encourage development of land to the north of Wychwood Avenue and potentially behind Grimshaw Hall.</p> <p>Permitted space precludes a full objection to the proposals, so a letter will be submitted.</p>
Q23	Mr Steve Coathup [6078]		<p>Together with the proposal to develop site 9, the additional traffic flow, and need for additional General Practice capacity will overwhelm the existing provision and infrastructure. Nowhere in the document is this recognised and represents a major <u>flaw in the masterplan</u></p>
Q23	Mr Tony Moon [4964]		<p>On reviewing the plans, this brownfield site , ticks all the boxes and offers the area a centre for sport, an additional comment would be to encompass other sports not currently available in the area.</p> <p>The development should be controlled through the implementation of the <u>neighbourhood plan</u>.</p>
Q23	Mr Vincent Essex [5421]		<p>Simply building more houses in one of the most / if not expensive areas within the borough only makes it available for a select few and in reality does not achieve the Councils goal of additional affordable housing for all on the scale required.</p>
Q23	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Many sites rejected where there are no existing physical features, yet there is no clearly defined physical boundary along northern edge of NW proposal and site does not follow field boundaries. Topography means site more visually intrusive in green belt and impacts on openness. Impact on Local Wildlife Site, TPOs, right of way and setting of Grimshaw Hall.</p> <p>SE proposal occupied by Knowle FC so question over deliverability. Further land promoted with potential impacts on Grimshaw Hall. Land is highly performing in Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>No very special circumstances to justify sports hub in green belt.</p>
Q23	Mrs Ruth Paige [5558]		<p>While I fully support the addition of community sports provision (which is currently lacking in the area) and cannot support the building of even more homes. The area has already had an additional 88 houses built on the Wootton Close estate and with the lack of public transport (the only bus that serves near this area has just been reduced to once an hour) the increase in traffic the 300 homes would add would be excessive. There are already large queues to get from the bottom of Hampton Road onto the Warwick Road. It would have a hugely negative impact.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]		Provided the local people benefit by using the enhanced sport facilities
Q23	Mrs Cathy Lynock [5437]		<p>I am a resident on Hampton Road and we have already seen a large housing development take place in the beautiful fields behind our houses. The football club and cricket club have been in existence since I moved to Knowle some 50 years ago. There was a television programme on not so long ago about the number of derelict houses in the UK - do something with these instead!</p> <p>We need to keep our english countryside!</p>
Q23	Mrs Claire Carter [5572]		The Hampton Road site has already seen significant development. Recognizing the need for more development, I support the proposal on the condition that the developer makes a significant investment in Knowle Primary Academy. The school has already had to move to 3 form entry in 1 year group partly as a result of the current Hampton Rd site development. Any future development should be conditional upon significant investment in the school to provide new permanent classrooms to accommodate the increase in pupils moving into the area. I strongly oppose any development without significant community investment, especially in schools.
Q23	Mrs E Hedley [3516]		Green Belt Assessment needs revisiting as land performs better against purposes 3 and 4 than indicated. Development would be a significant encroachment into countryside and Green Belt. Impact on setting of Grimshaw Hall. Contest view that site accessible and has good access to facilities, as 1km or more from shops/school. The topography and changes in level have not been considered and the location of the sports site well beyond any reasonable access by public transport is not acceptable. LWS should be excluded from site in Masterplan. Please see the response from the KDBH Forum which I support and fully endorse.
Q23	Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [6162]		<p>I support the representations made by KDBH Neighbourhood Forum</p> <p>I do not support the use of the land south of Hampton Rd for high density housing. All mature trees to be protected. Area abuts a wildlife site must be taken into consideration. Land to north has limited capacity due to its topography. Use of land for sports development will have unacceptable impact on the surrounding green belt, light pollution in particular affecting a very wide area. Extensive ground works will be required to overcome the natural topography which makes it unsuitable for sports development as envisaged.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Mrs Faye Doble [4650]		<p>It should be evaluated as 2 sites.</p> <p>South - adjacent developer owned land could provide additional amenity/sporting facilities and be more easily accessible and remain buffer to Grimshaw Hall.</p> <p>North - good/neglected agricultural in Green Belt with wonderful wildlife. Footpath well walked/enjoyed by villagers. SE boundary is housing, but NW is Purnells Brook. Development runoff would increase flooding here. Development here violates Green Belt & Meriden Gap. Extra Traffic on Hampton Road would be congestion/pollution problem. Existing housing must remain village boundary. Should not round up to Wychwood Avenue which is Copt Heath Boundary.</p>
Q23	Mrs Jane Starling [3207]		<p>This is an unnecessary encroachment into green belt. It would not round off the settlement in a logical manner because Wychwood Avenue is mostly invisible from Hampton Road because of the wooded area and there are only 6 houses visible on Chantry Heath Crescent.</p> <p>The draft masterplan suggests building medium density housing at the Chantry Heath end which is now pleasantly low density and low density housing near the new proposed sports hub. Who will buy expensive houses next to a floodlit sports hub/football ground with its associated noise and bad language?</p> <p>Hampton Lane cannot support extra traffic and parking</p>
Q23	Mrs Jill Collins [3784]		<p>The Warwick Road is currently heavily congested in the mornings and evenings. It could not cope with the traffic generated by 300+ homes on site 8 trying to join it from Hampton Road.</p> <p>Parking in Knowle is extremely difficult now. There is simply no space to accommodate any more cars.</p> <p>The small new proposed primary school would not be able to cope with all the children from the new houses on sites 8 and 9 - especially if the current Catholic primary school is closed and the site used for even more housing.</p>
Q23	Mrs Julia Gilroy [5637]		<p>Site 8: Hampton Road should not be built on. The area is classic "countryside" easily accessed from Knowle village and includes important local wildlife sites & popular countryside footpaths</p> <p>The proposed development threatens the "village" nature/ countryside feel of the area. Knowle doesn't have the infrastructure or capacity i.e. schools & health to accommodate the proposed extra housing. The road network is already highly congested at peak times & this proposed increase in dwellings will make this worse, increase pollution in the area & potentially increase vehicle accidents.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Mrs Karen Allen [6190]		I object to any incursion into the Green Belt. Part of the housing requirement for Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath is related to the Wider Housing Market Area. There are plenty of derelict and brown field sites in Birmingham that should be used first to accommodate Birmingham's housing needs before green belt land is built on, this would also reduce Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath's housing requirement figures. Solihull council should object strongly to WHMA. The roads and junctions that would serve this development are inadequate. Infrastructure is already under strain.
Q23	Mrs Laura Dunne [3806]		There is nothing in the plan to say how this additional housing would be catered for by the existing village facilities. Would these new houses fall within the catchment area for Knowle Primary Academy which is already over-subscribed? If so then the developers should be expected to contribute to any development required by the school to accommodate additional pupils. What additional infrastructure (parking, doctors etc) will be put in place to reflect the impact on the village of the additional housing so close to the village centre?
Q23	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		A better alternative to Site 9 with fewer traffic/congestion implications if the <u>correct infrastructure solutions are found.</u>
Q23	Mrs Sarah Letters [6037]		I object to building houses on green belt land, when there are brownfield sites within the borough that could be used instead.
Q23	Ms Mali malika [6010]		<u>not a suitable site- will add on more congestion</u>
Q23	Naomi Sheard [5894]		Hampton road is currently very congested. Developing these sites without further <u>public transport options would exacerbate the situation.</u>
Q23	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		Objection to high density development of Knowle Football Club along Hampton Lane within existing green belt land. Developers should guarantee that Sports Facilities should be completed prior to residential redevelopment of Knowle Football Club and Cricket Ground to allow club continuity. Protection of Heritage Assets and setting of Grimshaw Hall; no encroachment shall be allowed on adjacent woodland. No consideration has been given to mains services to proposed housing, including electricity, gas, water supply, mains drainage, telecommunications. Some land areas may be located within a flood zone of Purnells Brook, and should not be built on.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		<p>Objection to proposals for Hampton Road site 8 in Knowle allocated within green belt land.</p> <p>No additional school places proposed at Knowle Primary School or Arden Academy.</p> <p>No additional medical facilities or GP surgery proposed.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to main services to proposed housing, including electricity, gas, water supply, mains drainage, telecommunications.</p> <p>No details provided of how the setting of Grimshaw Hall and surrounding woodland will be protected.</p> <p>Satisfactory relocation of Knowle Football Club and Cricket Ground must be achieved prior to housing redevelopment.</p> <p><u>Some land areas may be located within a flood zone of Purnells Brook.</u></p>
Q23	Roger Atkinson [5993]		Green belt land should not be built on - otherwise what is the point of designating it as green belt
Q23	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q23	SOS Limited (ms anne hem) [6013]		bad decision for this site
Q23	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	<p>Whilst the ambitions of this site to provide a sports hub should be welcomed.</p> <p>There appears to be a number of questions over the size of buffer required between the site and nearby listed buildings. As a result, questions need to be raised over the whether it will be possible to deliver the number of dwellings set out in the masterplan.</p>
Q23	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		<p>SE consider that the proposed policy allocating the site should include the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - allocate the sports hub site - playing fields (playing pitches and ancillary facilities) should not be developed upon until replacement provision is made in line with the requirements of NPPF paragraph 97(b) and SE Playing Fields Policy. - State that the construction of the playing pitches, floodlighting and changing facilities should accord with SE and relevant NGB guidance. - require a ball strike assessment should cricket site be retained <p>Site identified as a location for 3G pitch which should be catered for in the policy</p>
Q23	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q23	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		The site is unsuitable for development as it would create an unacceptable skyline on this approach to Knowle. The contours of the site will result in a prominent development. Using the canal as a defensible barrier could open up surrounding areas around the canal for development. Harm to the setting of Grimshaw Hall. Impact on Knowle Conservation area from traffic generated by the development, particularly around the Hampton Road / High Street junction. Adverse impact on ecology and inappropriate loss of Green Belt.
Q23	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q23	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		We therefore strongly object to this site allocation as it doesn't appear that the LWSs can be retained. Local Wildlife Sites are of at least county value and should be protected as part of the planning process. They are core components of our ecological network/ Nature Recovery Network.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Alan Lang [5662]		Support only with Option 2
Q24	Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]	Urban Vision Partnership Ltd (Mrs Janette Findley) [3046]	<p>This representation is made on behalf of the governors of Arden School, Station Road, Knowle, and Mr Ved Goswami. We firmly support the proposed allocation of Site 9 for housing and associated infrastructure, to include a new Arden Centre for Community Learning (ACCL). We therefore support Concept Masterplan Option 2 in principle, but with the caveat that the site presents the scope to realise a greater overall housing capacity than the estimated total of 600 dwellings assumed. This will be essential in order to make Option 2 commercially viable.</p> <p>Arden School Governors aspire to create a new Arden Centre for Community Learning.</p> <p>Rationale for redevelopment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bulk of premises no longer fit for purpose Hindering students' potential for attainment and wider community use Patchwork of development on site from previous extensions. Renovations no longer possible Updating current site would take 10 years, and cost Â£18M, which is not financially viable Parts of building over 50 years old Not energy efficient to heat, costs an additional Â£100K/year to run. Site at capacity, insufficient school facilities and in poor condition in areas <p>ACCL will provide new community facilities such as gym, pool, private nursery, potential new primary school, recreation areas, multi-games area, drama/music rooms etc.</p> <p>Option 2 is only viable option.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Arden Academy Board of Governors (Martin Carter) [6210]		<p>Supports allocation of site 9, option 2 which shows the relocation of Arden Academy to an alternative site within site 9 and residential development on the existing site.</p> <p>Option 1 is not supported. Overall achievable capacity within option 2 has the potential for a larger contribution to the approximately 1,000 homes earmarked for Knowle than identified in the consultation document and may be necessary to make option2 viable.</p> <p>A new Arden centre for community learning should form an integral part of the masterplan for this area in order to secure medium and longterm educational, social, environmental and economic benefits for the local community. There is a compelling argument for a purpose built school, existing site is tightly constrained and no longer fit for purpose, additions over the years have led to a patchwork of development with poor interconnectivity, investment required to up date the site is around 18 million and would make Arden a building site for years hindering education, energy efficiency is poor and annual maintenance costs are high.</p> <p>Current site presents significant safety issues at the main entrance on Station Road, there is no parking for parents. School has no gym, floodlit facilities or swimming pool. Physical condition of the building creates challenges for the teaching and learning environment. Proposes a sports centre with swimming pool, fitness centre, arts theatre, recreation space and playing fields, conference /meeting facilities, day nursery, multi weather pitches, drama / dance rooms, improved community safety with significant reduction in traffic on parking routes, youth zone, potential to co-locate a new primary school. Cannot support option 1 as academy is retained on site and current difficulties will worsen and would still need to absorb the same level of housing development. Redevelopment of existing school site presents the scope to build at a higher density than elsewhere across site 9 taking advantage of existing scale and height of buildings and presents scope for more affordable housing.</p> <p>Suggests revisions to concept master plan (see attached) and proposed phasing plan</p> <p>Online questionnaire on consultation with 502 responses indicated the following:90.4% of respondents agreed site 9 should be included as an allocation of 4% agreed with option 2 being developed which would enable a new school to</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Arden Multi Academy Trust (Mr Martin Murphy) [1685]		Supports allocation, with new Arden Centre for Community Learning forming an integral part of masterplan. Concept Masterplan Cannot support Option 1 as would not address problems of the ageing campus. Support Option 2 in principle as includes new school, but concerned that the masterplan proposes insufficient housing land to ensure new school is viable. Increased capacity is achievable by increasing density of development on existing school site, reflecting the existing buildings height and scale, and providing additional affordable housing, and by including available land parcels within the overall site not currently proposed for development.
Q24	C Blakey [4866]		A tremendous opportunity to have a much needed enhanced Academy, relieve Station Road traffic congestion and provide appropriate new housing with minimised financing needs. The village overall will benefit from this development which meets various needs all at the one time in addition to helping Solihull's new housing requirements. The village recently forwent the opportunity to have a new Village Hall and Waitrose store and cannot afford to pass up yet another opportunity.
Q24	Christina Hyde [4925]		Development of this site could represent a huge benefit to the local area, but ONLY IF the opportunity was taken to build a new school and community facilities at the same time. The current school is outdated and energy inefficient and creates problems with parking at the beginning and end of the school day. A brand new school as proposed (Site 9, Option 2) would be a fantastic facility for the local students and community alike.
Q24	Christopher Kiddle Morris [5733]		The Mind Garden should not be included within Site 9 to ensure for the long term these much needed mental health care facilities and the bio-diversity work undertaken. The development of Site 9 whilst otherwise appropriate will further increase the current traffic jams at peak times on Warwick Road and Knowle High Street. Another route around the High Street needs to be found. The siting of a new primary school as per Option 2 for Arden Academy will encourage parking to pick up children on Station Road adjacent to Purnells Way with high risk safety issues. Option 1 preferred

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Claire Tucker [6164]		The site is within green belt & development should only occur when there are no sequentially preferable sites available in the borough not just kdbh. A substantial number of houses are being put forward in the kdbh area which will change the character of the area significantly notwithstanding the recently built housing developments that have already seen increased pressures on existing infrastructure whether that be highways, education, open space play provision etc & erode the green openness that currently exists. The high density development fronting Station Rd is out of character on option 2
Q24	Clare Gow [5522]		Support the proposal to relocate Arden Academy to alternative location to provide new school buildings and associated facilities.
Q24	Colin Davis [3352]		Ardens Academy's plans for high density housing should not be considered. Too many new developments in Solihull are cramped and poorly laid out.
Q24	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		yes. However, there are concerns over the relocation of Arden School. The phasing would need to be coordinated in such a manner so as not to reduce Secondary School place provision during the work. This particular component requires careful planning and monitoring of future demand for Secondary School places at what could be a critical time. With Secondary School pupil numbers set to grow by 20% over the next decade, it should be considered that the new Arden School site factors in potential additional student capacity in its design.
Q24	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		Objection to the relocation of Arden School. I think it should stay in it's present position on the site. Some of the buildings are less than 10 years old and there was extensive redevelopment of the site prior to it becoming an Academy. There was a huge amount of public investment when it was an LEA School and it would be most inefficient to demolish perfectly good Educational Buildings. I am concerned it would be, in effect, a Private enterprise profiting from the investment of the public purse. Notwithstanding this significant issue, relocation will course upheaval to the students' education.
Q24	CPRE Warwickshire Branch (Mark Sullivan) [6193]		Site 9 should not be allocated in the Local Plan Review. Proposals to surround Knowle village with extensive housing to its north (Site 8) and south (Site 9) would undermine the Conservation Area's character and setting because Knowle would become a town in terms of population size and urban extent. Impact on Knowle Conservation Area, most important in the Borough and other heritage assets. Would have the effect of developing open land to the north of the historic village and removing the countryside setting that remains to that side of Knowle. Turning settlement from village to more like a town. Loss of Green Belt

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Strategic Land and Property Team of SMBC (acting in the Council's capacity as land owner) [6043]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	Supports release of this land to provide a sustainable location for the development of new homes to help the Borough achieve its housing requirement. The land does not fulfil the five purposes of the Green Belt as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2018). SMBC land ownership extends to approximately 46ha immediately to the rear of Station Road, including the Arden Academy site and playing field. Are aware of the aspirations of the Academy and the Arden 2020 'The New Arden - A Centre for Community Learning' consultation being undertaken by the school. The remainder of Site P09 is in different ownership but the Council are keen to work with other landowners to develop a comprehensive master plan. PO5 is located close to central Knowle with existing road infrastructure connecting the site along the A4141 to Solihull and further afield to Warwick and Leamington Spa. The site is within a mile radius of Knowle and Dorridge High street centres, Dorridge train station and bus stops for services to surrounding areas. The site has clear, strong defensible boundaries with the A4141 Warwick Road to the east, Grove Road to the south and the built up residential area of Knowle to the north and west. A parcel of land within the west of the proposed allocation is currently being built out for residential use. In advance of the Submission Draft consultation, SMBC Strategic Land and Property are proposing to engage with other landowners to develop a comprehensive masterplan for the delivery of the site.
Q24	Dr Linda Parsons [3849]		Arden School does not need to relocate as there is enough land on its current site. Green belt should not be used/sacrificed. Knowle does not need more housing. The village cannot take any more housing. Its character would be destroyed. There is a problem with parking already. Traffic flow will increase. I cannot support this proposal
Q24	Dr A Jickells [2008]		This is Green Belt land and there is no justification for it being lost to build. The number of houses is too large and together with Site 8 would lead to a huge loss of character of the village. The existing village facilities could not cope with the extra houses. All the traffic would travel along the Warwick Rd into the village, making the existing traffic and safety issues worse.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Dr David Gentle [5915]		<p>The site is too big and poorly located. The boundaries are problematic. Access routes will exacerbate traffic congestion, parking problems and pollution.</p> <p>There are issues of LA funding priorities with Option 2. The scheme has grown beyond its original concept, entailing the allocation of massive public funding to one establishment. Option 1 would give the LA more flexibility in addressing more urgent needs.</p> <p>Need to address street view - concern at what is meant by 'perimeter block development to encourage active streets'.</p> <p>Lack of clarity about the proposal for the Music/Drama block.</p>
Q24	Dr Lucy Hillman [6184]		<p>Building on Green Belt land when there is land that is better suited to take such a large development and that has more infrastructure seems ridiculous. Just because land is owned by someone that wants to make a lot of money does not mean that that land is best suited for development. Green belt land should not be sold to people who have no interest in the place it resides in or the people living within the nearby villages. They have no interest in the land other than to sell it on to developers for profit and get planning agreed</p>
Q24	Dr Paul Rylah [5503]		<p>The site is completely on the wrong side of the village. Most of the new residents will not be using public transport but their own cars. That is a simple reality of the demographics and the modern world we live in. And most will be commuting North through the village, to Solihull, Birmingham, the M42, the airport, HS2 stations etc in pursuit of work and shops. The proposed development is also way too large for the village to absorb. A far better site is the Solihull Gap bordering and south of the M42, whilst still maintaining the gap as well.</p>
Q24	Duchy Homes Ltd [6036]	Barton Willmore Planning (Miss Hiteshree Kundalia) [6035]	<p>Only two sites have been identified for residential development within and around Dorridge (Site 8: Hampton Road, capacity 300-350 and Site 9: Arden Triangle, capacity 600), both of which are large sites. There is no evidence provided on the deliverability of these sites, include the timescales for housing to come forward. However, smaller Sites such as our Client's, are more deliverable within the early years of the Plan. This will help to address the known affordability issues in Dorridge and the wider Borough.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		There are a number of ordinary watercourses (Cuttle Brook and unnamed) across the site, however our 'Flood Map for Planning' only shows the flood risk from watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km ² , mapping of the risk from the watercourse has not been undertaken and as such this is the only reason the site is shown to lie in low risk Flood Zone 1. The assessment of flood risk and easement from the ordinary watercourse should be agreed with the LLFA, however we strongly recommend that hydraulic modelling of the watercourse is undertaken as part of a Level 2 SFRA to inform of the developable area and capacity of this potential allocation. Regardless of flood risk, we recommend an unobstructed green corridor is maintained along the banks of the watercourse for the purposes of protecting and maintaining green and blue infrastructure.
Q24	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q24	Gill Corns [4448]		I object to the plans for such a large area of residential development on Green Belt land also to the words used suggesting that it is in "a moderately performing parcel of Green Belt". This is an important area of Green Belt that contributes to the character of Knowle and the local flora and fauna. See Crestwood Environmental Report of 09/01/19 which underlines the environmental importance of the area and I wholeheartedly agree with them that building should be restricted north of the footpath across the centre of the site. I support the Knowle Society document Page 4 & 5
Q24	Gillian Griggs [3964]		Too many outstanding issues regarding the justification for allocation. Future of Arden Academy not resolved, no comprehensive Masterplan meetings, or information on transportation impacts. Spatial Strategy one of worst performing. If Arden Academy not relocated, no community benefit/justification for site against others on S&E edge. Must include significant improvements to school. No indication of location for primary school or shops/health facilities. No indication of traffic impacts or how public transport will be improved. Topography/levels not addressed. Development in sensitive southern area should be limited/further justified. Density too high, should reduce N>S, W>E. Open space should be separate from natural areas, which should protect linkages and be deliverable. Future of Lansdowne House unclear. Strong structural planting required. Support recommendation that development should be subject to SPD/Design Code.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	<p>Before allocating this site the Council needs to satisfy itself that the site is deliverable. The scheme is controlled by numerous landowners and requires complex infrastructure delivery. There has to be a concern about delivery of this site, and particularly over how long that could take. At best much of the housing will be delivered in the later stages of the local plan period.</p> <p>The whole rationale and concept behind the site to date is that it would secure delivery of a replacement secondary school. Option 1 excludes this and objection is raised to this.</p> <p>Please see full representation.</p>
Q24	Grove Road Residents [6249]	Pegasus Group (David Onions) [6248]	<p>The allocation is inappropriate and has not been adequately justified. The southern portion of the site is sensitive in both Green Belt and landscape character terms. Access arrangements from the South are also difficult and if pursued will have even greater impact on the sensitive landscape character of this part of the site and impact on the setting of designated heritage assets. The Draft Concept Masterplan must be re-drawn to ensure that built development to the South extends no further than the existing public footpath linking Warwick Road with Grove Road.</p>
Q24	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	<p>Difficult to distinguish between Site 9 and Amber Site A5 Blue Lake Road, and latter will round off development alongside Site 9.</p> <p>Blue Lake Road aligned with Site 9 in terms of accessibility.</p> <p>Uncertainty over Site 9 due to different land ownerships and land parcels, which risks not delivering allocated housing numbers. All the land at Blue Lake Road now under control of Heywood Developments, is available now and can deliver housing within first 5 years of Plan period.</p>
Q24	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		<p>Historic England acknowledges the SMBC Draft illustrative Concept Masterplan which suggests how potential future development might respond to the affected heritage assets. It will be important that assumptions are underpinned by adequate evidence.</p>
Q24	James Hatton [3312]		<p>I strongly object to any plans to build on green belt to the east of Knowle, becoming known as the Arden triangle, as this area is the real green belt around the greater Birmingham and Solihull conurbation, which should not be allowed to creep out any further. Also the access to this side of the village is essentially limited with no space for bypass or proper infrastructure. Roads in this area already struggle from significant over capacity at peak times.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Janet Royle [4227]		<p>I find it hard to believe land South of Knowle is 'medium landscape character sensitivity'. It is an attractive rural site and provides a green and pleasant entry to the village centre with much mature trees and wildlife - birds including nesting buzzards, bats, muntjac deer. It is being considered only because the landowners who stand to gain have submitted it.</p> <p>It is wasteful and environmentally unsound to knock down existing School buildings - some of which have been relatively recently built at some expense. (And why were academies given LA land for free to do as they please?)</p>
Q24	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update of the evidence base re-enforces and re-supports the allocation of the site. - Kier Group Ltd have engaged consultants dealing with a range of issues in relation to the site. All the evidence supports inclusion of the site. - Consider that the
Q24	Kier Living Ltd [5867]		<p>SHELAA housing trajectory demonstrates that Council is relying on a number of large-scale strategic allocations to deliver dwellings early in the Emerging Plan period. Site 9 comprises 9 separate areas/ownerships with no indication consortium or agreement formed. SHELAA identifies 50% of site constrained by contaminated land/landfill site and unclear that this could be remediated to deliver development within 5 years. Decision on possible relocation of Arden Academy an added complication. Plan should require site-wide masterplan/development brief to be approved before applications made. Without agreement, high risk that 400 dwellings will not be delivered in first 5 years.</p>
Q24	Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]		<p>There remain too many outstanding issues regarding the justification for development in this area to be able to support this allocation in principle. The studies undertaken on behalf of the NF raise significant concerns about the scale of development,. Fundamental issues regarding the future of Arden Academy and the impacts of this scale of development on local infrastructure have still not been addressed. If Arden Academy is not relocated, there is no real wider community benefit from such a scale of development and no justification for the release of the land to the east of the Academy.</p>
Q24	Lauren Reilly [4980]		<p>I support only if the second concept is adopted. I.e relocating and building a new Arden Academy. If we are to build 600 new homes on green belt land there MUST be a benefit for the local community. The current school is not fit for modern day teaching and compared to other local authority schools is way behind the times.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Lisa Taylor [6129]		Arden School to be relocated to an alternative location on the site, with residential development on the site of the existing Academy.
Q24	Lucilla Lang [5664]		Support only with option 2
Q24	Lucy Shepherd [5792]		Arden Academy desperately needs work so out of two options I would support option 2 and school relocation. However, I object to any high density housing given loss of green belt and dramatic change of character it would mean, particularly in light of poor existing developments (Middlefield). Knowle will not be a village if this continues. If we must have more housing, I support option 2 for new Arden and new primary school, but we need better public transport, low density housing to fit in with what is here already and no more widening of the catchment area for Arden.
Q24	M Lopez [6014]		Whilst I do not totally support the number of houses/units being planned for this area, I do support site 9, option 2 which has been developed with Arden school's involvement, BUT ONLY on the condition that the school does not increase any further in size, I.e. no larger than a 10 form entry school.
Q24	Mark Irvine [5717]		Strong support for moving the school. I do not support the plan retaining the school in its existing location
Q24	Mel Starling [4325]		New housing built will be able to access Knowle Dorridge and Bentley Heath easily This site consists of moderately performing greenbelt. Build 750 houses here and improve Ardens sports facilities for all to use. Dentist and doctors surgeries already exist. Close to rail links bus services shops Supermarkets
Q24	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q24	Miss Elizabeth Brace [3102]		Consider impact on Barn End Grade II listed building. Opportunity to close Grove Road between Barn End and Warwick Road, re-routing traffic through Arden Triangle and maintaining as footway/cycleway/bridleway/wildlife corridor. Create new LWS around Cuttle Brook corridor. Maintain wildlife corridor between Mind site and Barn End LWS, reinforcing by keeping development back from Grove Road/Warwick Road corner. Restore dilapidated hedge between development and Grove Road and enhance abandoned garden between 88/98 Grove Road. Consider a wildlife underpass for the new estate road, and/or bridging the new road over Cuttle Brook.
Q24	Mr & Mrs D Green [4909]		We support Site 9 (Option 2). If this site comes forward it should include the new secondary school. Without the school the site is not justified. The new secondary school is fully supported. We do not support Site 9 (Option 1) as it excludes the school

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mr Adrian Baker [3433]		I firmly believe that the large area of Green Belt land south of Knowle for residential development is too large as set out by the Knowle Society document previously attached. The relocation of the Academy option is NOT a good enough reason to build 600 homes on this site. The Crestwood Environmental report dated 09/01/19 (prepared for KDBH Forum) advises that IF any development takes place this should be restricted to the north of Cuttle Brook due to access and environmental constraints
Q24	Mr Alex Wiseman [5845]		I feel the number of houses proposed for the Arden Triangle is excessive. This is due to the excessive demands this number would place on existing infrastructure (not only roads but also GPs, schools etc.) A lower number closer to half of that proposed seems more acceptable.
Q24	Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]		Site 9 should not be included as in principle objection due to overriding importance of green belt, poorly performing in terms of Spatial Strategy/Sustainability Appraisal. Inadequate regard for landscape value and capacity, traffic impacts. Quantum of housing in relation to community/infrastructure benefits, which are unclear, not justified by viability assessment. Large parts of site not accessible. Future of Arden Academy not resolved, suitability of replacement site not demonstrated, no clarity on need for primary school. Option 1 poorly integrated with existing built-up area. Concept masterplans need strengthening to refer to important features that may need to be retained/constraints, safeguard landscape/biodiversity, secure new structural planting/ provision of open space and wildlife corridors, limit extent of development, consider densities, confirm position of Lansdowne House and introduce appropriateness of Supplementary Planning Guidance/Design Coding.
Q24	Mr Andrew Moore [5979]		This is over development with no plans for increased road traffic and congestion that will be created by 2 new schools and circa 1200 new homes, Knowle and its High Street are a conservation area that can barely cope with the traffic currently let alone the increase in construction traffic and subsequent traffic created. Smaller sites spread throughout the Borough have less impact on areas and communities. Also situated along side the motorway corridors which have not been developed yet will help road congestion. Knowle, Dorridge and BH have more car use than other areas due to lack of public transport.
Q24	Mr Antony Stonehewer [5729]		The area 9 should be dependant upon the construction of a new secondary school with appropriate sixth form site. The current Arden schools buildings are in efficient and do not serve the pupils or the community. By constructing a new school at a better location will improve traffic along station rd and provided benefits to the community

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mr B Bohanna [2056]		A TERRIFIC IDEA TO GET A NEW SCHOOL TO REPLACE THE CURRENT AGEING ARDEN ACADEMY WHICH WILL HELP WITH THE INFLUX OF NEW YOUNGSTERS AS A CONSEQUENCE OF THE ADDITIONAL HOUSING. THIS MOVE WILL SAVE TRAFFIC PROBLEMS ON STATION ROAD. GREAT IDEA THE QUICKER THE BETTER
Q24	Mr Bob Holtham [3530]		This is no more logical as an extension to the settlement than any number of alternatives given that it would overload Knowle High Street. If development is justified in support of improving or relocating the school(s) it should be limited to the area most accessible to the village centre and no further south than the LWS at Cuttle Brook as set out in the independent Landscape Assessment prepared for KDBH NF by Crestwood. The Council should identify other potential allocations to take up any shortfall in required housing numbers as proposed by the Knowle Society.
Q24	Mr Brian Hillman [6003]		Site 9 is not suitable as allocated site due to being Green Belt with a wonderful aspect as you approach Knowle/Dorridge village. There would be a safety issue of 600 x 2 vehicles per household entering and exiting the proposed development. The settlement of the Villages would be irrevocably damaged and would just be a compacted sprawl of houses.
Q24	Mr David Hillyer [6026]		Concept master plan - We would support the option which allows the school to be moved to a new location with a new building.
Q24	Mr David Lloyd [3278]		Green belt and local amenity should be protected. Development is inappropriate.
Q24	Mr David Phillips [5545]		I don't oppose the building of new houses on Arden triangle but do oppose the new school as it had a new block recently and is adequate. To build a school and then houses would double the length of construction time and have a greater impact. The safety of children walking to 5 schools is imperative- option 1 is least construction traffic and time. Another primary school isn't needed and would add to traffic as children out of catchment will fill places. Already a significant issue with parking and traffic which you are trying to address.
Q24	Mr David Power [5941]		Destroying Green Belt land south of Knowle for houses is not the right decision in my opinion, the plan is not thought out and excessive for the reasons set out in the Knowle Society document attached. See paragraphs at the bottom of page 4 & top of page 5 which I support. Also see Crestwood Environmental report dated 09/01/19 (prepared for KDBH Forum) which examines the vital environmental constraints and concludes that if development is to take place at all it should be restricted to land north of the footpath across the middle of the site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mr David Roberts [2570]		The overdevelopment of Knowle with Hampton Road will create an enormous traffic jam at rush hour times. Over prescribed schools, doctors and car parking.
Q24	Mr Dean Henry [6161]		We OBJECT to the development of Site 9, Land South of Knowle. The development falls within Green Belt. The existing road infrastructure is not able to support the additional traffic that will be generated from 600 houses (up to 1800 additional vehicles). Knowle High Street is already a bottleneck for traffic and for people travelling to Solihull for additional amenities, e.g. shopping and access to the M42 for access to Birmingham and the motorway network. Additional houses the wrong side of Knowle will increase the burden of traffic on Knowle High Street, particularly in rush hour periods and school runs.
Q24	Mr Don Grantham [5489]		The inclusion of the significant area of Green Belt land south of Knowle for residential development is excessive, and flawed for the reasons set out in the Knowle Society document. Specifically the paragraphs at the bottom of page 4 & top of page 5 are well reasoned and I support them completely. Also I would refer you to the Crestwood Environmental report dated 09/01/19 (prepared for KDBH Forum) covering the vital environmental constraints and concludes that if development is to take place at all it should be restricted to land north of the footpath across the middle of the site.
Q24	Mr Gordon OConnor [6064]		I support and endorse the response of KDBH Forum
Q24	Mr Gordon OConnor [6064]		I support and endorse the response of KDBH Forum
Q24	Mr Gordon OConnor [6064]		I support and endorse the response of KDBH Forum.
Q24	Mr Graeme Chaplin [5984]		Arden school premises are not fit for purpose - they are far too small for current pupil numbers and extremely old. New buildings would reduce running costs and provide an educational setting which would promote learning & achievement. I support Option 2 as the only practical way of achieving that improvement, given the lack of funding available to rebuild otherwise.
Q24	Mr Gregory Lawson [5960]		A new, larger school is unnecessary and will cause traffic chaos. This land is green belt. The mayor has only recently said that green belt land should not be used. The development will destroy the approach to Dorridge and its separation from Knowle. The Crestwood report has identified the landscape and environmental objections to it. The report specifically highlights the existing ribbon development on Grove Road and its low capacity for development in order to preserve the current character of that road and its character as an approach to Dorridge. Grove road is a minor local road.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mr Harvey Scriven [3790]		Strongly against the policy of any expansion into the green belt, including this site. There is no proven case to build in the green belt. The scale of proposed development is inappropriate for the size of the village. By encouraging development in the green belt, you are directly contravening government policy, specifically: " The Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence."
Q24	Mr Ian Leedham [5887]		- Arden school has had considerable investment with construction of a Â£1m Multi Use Games Area and new buildings which have cost millions to furnish. - There have not been returns on these investments and reselling the land is a dubious use of S106.
Q24	Mr John Allen [6191]		I do not believe that any greenbelt land should be developed. However, accepting that this land has potential for development I would argue that the school should remain where it is. The money spent on moving the school would be better spent on improving the infrastructure of the area to accommodate it's potential expansion, in such areas as doctors and provision for young people eg youth clubs.
Q24	Mr John Hornby [5851]		The findings of the Crestwood Environmental Landscape and Visual appraisal of the Arden triangle development (commissioned by the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum and published in January 2019) is new evidence that the Council needs to take into account as it develops proposals to be included in the next version of the Local Plan. In particular, the Council should adopt the report's proposal that the public right of way that runs east-west some 300m north of Grove Road should be the "natural limit to development" in this area.
Q24	mr Kan Karan [6011]		Support -option 1- school should remain on its existing site with development on surrounding sites Object option 2- school should not be relocated
Q24	mr Kan Karan [6011]		Support -option 1- school should remain on its existing site with development on surrounding sites Object option 2- school should not be relocated
Q24	Mr Kar Karan [6067]		a) . I support Option 1 where Arden school remains at its current location b) I object to Option 2 wherein Arden school is relocated to the new site-

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	mr Karan Goswami [6089]		This site has all the positive features which make it one of the best sites in the borough. It can accommodate more new houses than the allocated numbers as well as provide significant benefits to the local people.
Q24	Mr Ken Curran [6079]		Excellent site for new development Option 1 (School remains at current site)-- SUPPORTED Option 2 (School moved to new site) - OBJECTED- will cause chaos & access problems
Q24	Mr Kym Soni [6188]		Knowle is already densely developed, without adding more residential property. The proposal to build another primary school, as well as Arden, and all the new properties means their will be inadequate playing fields for the children, plus the fact the stationary traffic would be emitting pollution to the detriment of the residents and school children's health. Electric vehicles, and the infrastructure to support them is a long way in the future. Fossil fuelled vehicles will be here until 2040!
Q24	Mr M Trentham [2114]		Support the allocation of Site 9. Concern on the current state of flux regarding the relocation of Arden Academy. They must come up with a financially viable and policy compliant scheme, or stand back and let us get on with the default Masterplan. Relocation of the school is not a requirement but a private project. The land is both suitable and deliverable and there will be contributions to on-site infrastructure. Masterplans are out of date and misleading. Option 2 is not a proceedable option at this stage. Option 1 should be the only masterplan for site 9.
Q24	Mr Mark O'Dwyer [5679]		Expansion of Primary School places east of the M42 has exclusively been in the state sector for many year now. St George and St Teresa Catholic Primary School is a high performing school that is is consistently over subscribed. Support the expansion of St George and St Teresa Catholic Primary School to provide proportionate provision for Catholic places in this area I would support the expansion on Primary School places on the Arden Triangle site. Support Option 2 and relocation of Arden Academy.
Q24	Mr Martin Archer [3315]		The Crestwood Arden Triangle Landscape Assessment was produced which makes clear the inadvisability of building further south than Cuttle Brook and the Right of Way.I think very serious note should be taken of this assessment
Q24	Mr Martin Murphy [3070]		Please see attached the representation from Arden Board of Governors

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mr Martin Murphy [3070]		Please see attached the response from Arden Multi-Academy Trust
Q24	Mr Martin Murphy [3070]		This is an excellent opportunity to create a new community facility for the area. I believe there is scope to build more houses (900) to ensure the infrastructure requirements of the a local area are created. There will be amazing community benefit for young and old. Fantastic opportunity for the community
Q24	Mr Matthew Bragg [3069]		This land is green belt and a mixture of farmed arable and the extensive gardens and pastures surrounding 1860 Warwick Road. Increasing the number of dwellings by 7.5%, will create further, unsolvable congestion and erode the character of the 'village'. The inclusion of the relocation of Arden school, whose numbers have swollen significantly over recent years is cynical when pupils travel into the area by train and car to attend.
Q24	Mr Michael Doble [3296]		If it is deemed necessary to develop this site, as it will be served by the Warwick Road, Station Road and hence the High Street, the additional traffic entering these already busy and narrow roads will cause considerable congestion especially in the High Street which is often part blocked by delivery vehicles. In which case any additional development to meet the housing numbers required should be located to the West or North of the village close to the M42 motorway. This would help limit congestion in Knowle village and be closer to the main centres of employment .
Q24	Mr Michael Harper [1912]		Concept Masterplan There is a section of the site running alongside and adjacent to Grove Road, specified on the plan to be "Low Density". This is highly desirable but I would suggest that it is taken one step further and left as open space - if considered appropriate I would suggest Public open space
Q24	Mr Nicholas Shepherd [6097]		I feel too many new houses are proposed for Knowle and Site 9 in particular is very large. I would prefer to see any new housing divided more equally with Dorridge and Bentley Heath. If this level of housing is genuinely needed, then I would support Site 9 but only if the redevelopment of Arden Academy forms part of the overall plan. The school is in need of significant works and this appears to be the only way to achieve them. I would object to development of Site 9 without a new school being built as part of it.
Q24	Mr Robert Lang [5634]		I support the allocated site with Option 2 only. A new school is vital for support of this option

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mr Roger Cook [2962]		Strongly object to site being used for housing. However, if passed then Option 1 is the preferred option - Option 2 is not acceptable. The promised 'land swap' benefits of Â£30m advocated on Option 2 will never materialise. Developers have a track record of promising community benefits which are not delivered. The Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath residents survey in 2016 was only supportive of large scale housing provided community benefits were provided. This has to be delivered if Option 2 selected. Note that although I prefer Option 1 there are no community benefits promised for this concept.
Q24	Mr Steve Coathup [6078]		This single site carries a hugely disproportionate share of the future needs of the borough. I do not accept that the land has a " medium landscape character sensitivity and low visual sensitivity and the landscape value of the area is medium".Expert testimony from Pegasus (reference paragraph 3) makes a sound case for excluding this site from the plan. The spatial strategy refers to the need for balance between large scale and dispersed developments. There is no evidence that this objective will be achieved by developing this site to the extent envisaged.
Q24	Mr Stuart Whitehill [5697]		I feel that the best option for the current and future generations is to support site 9, option 2, making any new housing development on the Arden Triangle contingent on the provision of a new Arden academy (and Primary School to ensure sufficient access for the increased number of homes and maintain access for current homes to existing schools).
Q24	Mr Tony Moon [4964]		The area identified , will provide the area with a new school and will stop the school of 1000 pupils etc emptying on to Station Rd, the school needs clear access and exits to several points to allow the pupils to disperse in to the surrounding area. Access is an issue , however through good planning and development access to the south of the area , east to Coventry , Poss Bypass to this area this will be minimised
Q24	Mr Ved Goswami [3079]		Ideal site for new development
Q24	Mrs Amy Fallis [6023]		A unique opportunity to enhance local facilities and secure state of the art educational opportunities for our young people.
Q24	Mrs Adrie Cooper [3119]		KDBH NP should be taken into account. The new Arden School should be built but with 400 homes of the type referred to in the NP.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mrs Ann Foxon [6177]		Supports the expansion of Catholic Primary education on the Arden triangle to extend the current fabulous provision of St George and St Teresa to ensure parity in the provision of places and be consistent with the earlier draft. Both Arden and St George and St Teresa have constrained sites. St George and St Teresa Catholic School has achieved a National reputation for its education. While there has been increased provision at a number of schools no additional places have been granted at Catholic Primary Schools in Solihull, the site is restricting the ability to deliver services to its community. The early draft plan recognised a need for a new Catholic Primary School and this was subsequently removed. St George and St Teresa School is 50 Years old, is on a restricted site and it would make sense to build a two form entry school fit for the 21st Century.
Q24	Mrs Barbara Davison [6167]		I feel the school is getting run down and prefer the idea of moving it and developing additional resources rather than trying to refurbish the existing building. If we are to have 700 new homes a swimming pool, theatre etc as well as other facilities must be included in the plan.
Q24	Mrs Claire Carter [5572]		I fully support the option to relocate Arden Academy on the site to ensure that any new housing brings the necessary investment into local infrastructure, notably the schooling. I do however oppose any new development that is not counter balanced by the full funding of a new Arden Academy & community facilities as these are already stretched & Arden is in desperate need of updating.
Q24	Mrs E Hedley [3516]		Do not believe Arden Academy needs to be relocated, as older buildings could be refurbished, and school caters from pupils outside area that should be educated elsewhere. Unless the school is re-located there is no wider community benefit from such a large scale development and far too many issues remain outstanding particularly traffic access and management. Development on the southern part would be particularly detrimental. Fragmented land ownership poses serious risk of piecemeal development. Please see the response from the Forum which I support and fully endorse.
Q24	Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [6162]		I support the comments made on behalf of the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum. Cannot support allocation due to complete lack of information on which to make a decision. No viability study available regarding the relocation of Arden Academy. No traffic impact study available. Moving the school will move traffic congestion to new location. Primary school details unavailable. Scale and visibility of development will have an unacceptable impact on surrounding area. Cost of relocating school will take all CIL so none available for other the community assets.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mrs Faye Doble [4650]		This is Green Belt. There are other sites nearer to M42 which gives access to employment areas which would be better considered for development. These are land either side of the M42 near Jct 4&5 and The Silhillians complex. Development of the Arden Triangle will adversely affect traffic congestion/pollution in Knowle.
Q24	Mrs Hannah Ager [6186]		The proposed allocation of this site will be very detrimental to the village of Knowle. This is a valuable area of Green Belt that is cherished by the community. The roads around this area of Knowle are very congested and could not support the proposed number of new homes. There are more sustainable sites closer to Dorridge or Widney Manor Railway Stations. Any allocation should not include the Warwick Road frontage, which provides the most valuable visual amenity and would also be dangerous to access. I strongly object to the allocation of this site and the densities of housing proposed.
Q24	Mrs Helen Baker [5930]		The Knowle Society Document dated Feb 2017 illustrates that including this large area of Green Belt land south of Knowle for residential development is flawed and excessive. If any development is considered it should be only to the north of the footpath across the middle site.
Q24	Mrs Jane Starling [3207]		I support the new primary school and some housing as if children lived close by there would be less traffic impact although I do not believe we need a 600 house development in a small village. I do not think Arden School should be completely rebuilt although they may be some scope for updating parts of it. If the school mostly accepted children from catchment area this would reduce traffic at peak times
Q24	Mrs Jayne Wood [5646]		Road infrastructure is a major concern. Already have significant traffic congestion in Knowle and surrounding area. Arden School has increased its intake from 8 to 10 forms, but only require 8 to satisfy the local community. A large number of pupils are from outside KDBH many from Birmingham postcodes. I cannot see that we require all the facilities Arden propose - we have an adequate Theatre in Solihull and plenty of gyms etc. Concerns that other schools in area will be neglected as funds will be concentrated on this ambitious plan.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mrs Jennifer Whitehill [3850]		<p>I support residential development on the site of the existing Arden Academy. I agree with Site 9 Option 2 being developed for housing that would enable the New Arden Academy - A Centre for Community Learning- to be built.</p> <p>I do not support and oppose Site 9 Option 1.</p> <p>The current Mind Garden must be left in its present location and size. I oppose any change to this.</p>
Q24	Mrs Jill Collins [3784]		<p>The Warwick Road is currently heavily congested in the mornings and evenings. It just could not cope with the extra traffic generated by 600 homes on site 9. Parking in Knowle is extremely difficult now. There is simply no space to accommodate any more cars. There would not be sufficient parking in Dorridge either.</p> <p>The small new proposed primary school would not be able to cope with all the children from the new houses on sites 8 and 9 - especially if the current Catholic primary school is closed and the site used for even more housing.</p>
Q24	Mrs Jill Hillman [5492]		<p>The Crestwood Arden Triangle Landscape Assessment gives full information why development should not extend any further south than Cuttle Brook and the Right of Way. Arden School only needs refurbishing as the entrance off Station Road is convenient and Safe. The proposed new site will mean cars and children accessing through a housing development. The 600 houses development is over development in a confined area which is already under pressure regarding infrastructure. Warwick Road and Grove Road are both inadequate roads to have a major development entering and exiting - major safety issue. The area should stay as Green Belt.</p>
Q24	Mrs Jovana Chaplin [5655]		<p>Option 2, the rebuilding of Arden away from it's current site, would be by far the better choice. 3 of my children have attended the school in recent times and we can affirm from experience that the school is bursting at the seams, the buildings grimy and demoralising and even the pavements on the way to school packed to overflowing. A radical rebuild is surely necessary. The present site is just far too small for the current school population, let alone the significantly larger one you envisage for the future.</p>
Q24	Mrs Julie Irvine [5982]		<p>Arden academy is in need of new buildings as its current ones were not designed to last this long and in serious need of repair. change of use of the site and a movement of the school to a new site with new up to date facilities will benefit both the children and the community.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mrs Karen Allen [6190]		I object to any development on green belt land, also to the relocation of Arden Academy. There is a swimming pool and theatre within 4 miles which is served by public transport from the area. Another swimming pool and theatre in the area are unlikely to be financially viable, and other infrastructure and facilities are needed (for older children, teenagers and young adults, doctors etc). Currently Arden Academy pupils benefit from being close to the Knowle public transport links and the shops benefit from their custom, in the proposed location for the new school this would not be the case.
Q24	Mrs Katherine Lang [5635]		I support this with Option 2 only.
Q24	Mrs Kathleen Hillyer [6031]		I support the proposal to move Arden School to another site within the locality .
Q24	Mrs Kavita Goswami [6086]		This is an ideal site for new housing / mix use development and we fully support it
Q24	Mrs Laura Dunne [3806]		Support for option 2 only. If the houses have to be built, then there should be benefit for the community in <u>the shape of a new school and community facilities.</u>
Q24	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		It has not been proven that the school can justify the proposed relocation or that the land swap will generate sufficient funding. Would that divert CIL payments away from other local projects and facilities? The Headmaster has said at one time that the School only 'needs' 450 new dwellings to support their proposal and therefore the allocation of further land in the south of the Triangle is not warranted considering A) the loss of high quality Green Belt landscape, B) the damaging impact on the setting of Knowle and C) the additional traffic activity at peak times.
Q24	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		The Concept Masterplans demonstrate that the School proposals can be accommodated in the northern part of the site IF PROVED VIABLE. The Crestwood Landscape Assessment prepared for the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum is clear that the land south of Cuttle Brook is high quality Green Belt and and could only be developed at low density. It should be removed from the proposed allocation and alternative higher density potential sites should be considered in other areas of KDBH.
Q24	Mrs Marjorie Archer [3558]		The houses in Grove Road should remain a "washed over" Green Belt and the land to the north between Grove Road and Knowle centre should remain Green Belt to provide a clear boundary to the existing residential area of the village

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Mrs Michele Bull [5580]		<p>I would like to see the community benefit from a new school and would, therefore, support Option 2, which includes building a new school on part of the land while using the site of the current school for housing.</p> <p>I understand that the funds to enable the school to be built would be realised by the building of the new houses knowle and Dorridge will no longer be villages as building 600 houses will totally change the area.</p>
Q24	Mrs Patricia Platt [5369]		<p>We certainly need smaller homes for the older people downsizing - most of the recent new ones built locally have 5/6 bedrooms.</p> <p>A new Catholic primary school would be good but where will children of other faiths go when primary schools are already full?</p>
Q24	Mrs Sarah Letters [6037]		<p>I do not believe that site 9 should be included as an allocated site, as it would be an enormous increase in the number of houses and I particularly object to building on green belt land when there are brownfield sites available elsewhere in the borough. Greenbelt land should only be used as the last resort, as it can never be replaced.</p> <p>The pressure on infrastructure caused by a development of the proposed size would be very damaging and it is not easy to see how Station Road, for example, could cope with the additional traffic</p>
Q24	mrs Sue Butler [5725]		I support Option 2
Q24	Ms B Bird [2065]		<p>Concept Masterplan</p> <p>I do not support the redevelopment of Arden Academy as described in option 2. It will impact adversely on the village environment and exacerbate the traffic situation even further. The school would have capacity for many more children from the immediate area if fewer were bused in from further afield. This also adds to the traffic problem. We should be encouraging families to school their children close to home, so they are able to walk.</p>
Q24	Ms Mali malika [6010]		<p>Concept master plan - I support option 1 and not option 2 of the published options.</p> <p>Reasons: Relocating the school to new site will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - only displace traffic congestion to other sites. - will require increased allocation of houses to make new school construction <p>I support option 1 to fulfil need for new houses required in the burrow</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Ms Mali malika [6010]		<p>Concept masterplan -I support option 1 and not not option 2 of the publised options.</p> <p>Reasons:Relocating the school to new site will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - only displce traffic congestion to other sites. - will require increased alloaction of houses to make new school construction <p>- I support option 1 to fullfill need for new houses required in the burrow</p>
Q24	Ms Malika Goswami [6088]		This is the best site which can accommodate more new houses than what has been allocated by SMBC, therefore I fully support it.
Q24	Naomi Sheard [5894]		This is too many homes and will change the dynamic of the neighborhood. The infrastructure can not support this number of homes.
Q24	Nick Ager [3055]		<p>Should not be allocated as it is valuable attractive green belt with a wide range of wildlife habitats. There is insufficient road capacity to cope with further significant development in this area of Knowle. Development would damage the character of the village and be out of keeping with the rural setting.</p> <p>Site is some distance from Dorrige railway station. Any development in this area should be south of the site close to the existing Middlefield development and away from Warwick Road. Access points to Warwick Road dangerous. I do not believe that Arden Academy needs to be relocated.</p>
Q24	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		<p>Objection to development of Site 9 South of Knowle within existing Green Belt. Visual impact of openness in the green belt on approach to Knowle along the A4141 will be lost.</p> <p>Photographic evidence is available of the quality of openness of fields and trees along Warwick Road.</p> <p>SMBC have redesignated Lansdowne House and 1817 Warwick Road onto Brownfield land register, without apparent consultation with neighbours. Tree felling occurred at Lansdowne House which has reduced the quality of the landscape here. No consideration has been given to mains services to proposed housing, including electricity, gas, water supply, mains drainage, telecommunications.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Persons with an interest Site 9 [4079]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Bhupinder Thandi) [4078]	Arden Triangle (Site 9) has been a consistent commitment by the Council throughout plan making in Solihull. The evidence base which justified the proposed allocation within the earlier draft Local Plan re-enforces and re-supports the allocation of the site within the current draft Local Plan Supplementary Consultation. The update to the evidence base does nothing to undermine the Council's approach to propose an allocation of the site and indeed supports the proposed allocation. Cerda Planning therefore support the allocation at the Arden Triangle (Site 9).
Q24	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Proposed development of land should have been subject to proper sustainability studies especially in respect of traffic and employment. Most traffic from site will need to travel to the north and west and road system at present will not be able to cope. Additionally employment opportunities should be provided by allocation of land for business purposes.
Q24	Roger Atkinson [5993]		This number of houses, in addition to the Hampton Road numbers, is simply too much for the area. It will change the village character of Knowle forever. Knowle is often gridlocked at the moment - especially late afternoon and early evening. This will make the position impossible. Why is all the major development in Knowle - the burden should be shared between Knowle and Dorridge
Q24	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q24	SOS Limited (ms anne hem) [6013]		Support option 1 of no reocation of school Object to 2- school should not be moved
Q24	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	An allocation on land to the south of Knowle is welcomed, however given the uncertainties around the number of units that can be realistically be delivered on site 8 at Hampton Road, the site to the south of Knowle should be extended to include additional land. Land east of Warwick Road and north of Wyndley Garden Centre could deliver 70 units and disperse traffic movements
Q24	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		The proposed allocation contains Arden Academy which has an AGP and several playing pitches. The local plan consultation document and site allocations masterplans identify that the School could be relocated subject to a number of factors. Should the school be relocated the playing fields and the AGP should be replaced in line with the requirements of NPPF paragraph 97 and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy. The replacement playing pitches, AGP and ancillary facilities should be constructed in accordance with Sport England's and relevant National Governing Bodies guidance.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	St George and St Teresa Catholic Primary School (Miss Michelle Flanagan) [6085]		<p>St George and St Teresa School would like to relocate to Site 9 in the same way as the plans for Arden School</p> <p>This would result in a 2FE Catholic school. The School has undertaken a comprehensive options appraisal and moving to the new site 9 is clearly the preferred option</p> <p>St George and St Teresa School have been in continuous contact with Arden School for a number of years and know we would be supported by Arden. The school has the support of key local stakeholders (Councillors and politicians)</p> <p>The new shared facilities would provide excellent opportunities for learning for the children of Solihull</p> <p>School is consistently oversubscribed and future demand suggests this will continue. This is likely to increase substantially in line with the anticipated growth illustrated in the Draft Local Plan. St George and St Teresa school's catchment is large and will typically pull children from the Solihull areas East of M42. . Expansion of Primary School places East of the M42 in the Borough has exclusively been in the state sector for many years now, it would make sense to expand St George and St Teresa Catholic Primary School and so providing first class Primary School provision in this part of Solihull</p> <p>Potentially releasing the current St George and St Teresa site, as it in the call for sites, could release pressure point e.g. for traffic etc surrounding Dorridge school and other adjacent areas</p>
Q24	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	<p>Unclear how Site 9 has been assessed as a 'green' site and site 207 has not. Clarification is sought on this matter.</p> <p>Site 9 performs similarly to site 207; however, Site 9 comprises multiple landowners / interests whereas site 207 is solely under clients control, providing more certainty and deliverability</p>
Q24	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q24	Strategic Land and Property Team SMBC [6226]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	<p>Release of this land would provide a sustainable location for the development of new homes to help the Borough achieve its housing requirement within the plan period.</p> <p>The site has clear, strong defensible boundaries with the A4141 Warwick Road to the east, Grove Road to the south and the built up residential area of Knowle to the north and west. A parcel of land within the west of the proposed allocation is currently being built out for residential use.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q24	Terry Corns [4446]		The inclusion of this large area of Green Belt land south of Knowle for residential development is flawed and excessive. In particular the paragraphs at the bottom of page 4 & top of page 5 are well reasoned and I support them wholeheartedly. Also see Crestwood Environmental report dated 09/01/19 (prepared for KDBH Forum) which examines the vital environmental constraints and concludes that if development is to take place at all it should be restricted to land north of the footpath across the middle of the site.
Q24	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		Development here will do nothing except worsen an already busy road network. Impact on ecology. High density homes on the site of the existing School is unsuitable, given prevailing character of the area. No definitive indication of how Arden relocation will be funded and redevelopment of Arden will create its own infrastructure problems. However, redevelopment would help to meet other infrastructure requirement including additional medical and community facilities. Option 2 is the only option for further examination in the next round of consultation and it would have to include a new junior or primary school.
Q24	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q24	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		We therefore object to all the concept plan options as they all indicate the loss of the grasslands which haven't been surveyed. We wish to see a concept plan that retains all areas of species rich grassland on a precautionary approach until such a time that a LWS survey indicates they would not qualify and are therefore less than of county significance.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Solihull Town Centre & Mature Suburbs			
Q25	Alex Gee [4167]		Infrastructure is inadequate to cope with additional homes proposed. Sharmans Cross road is already gridlocked at morning and evening rush hours, with queues of traffic both ways to Streetsbrook Road and Danford Lane. Inadequate parking and loss of wildlife habit.
Q25	Andrew Cherry [4230]		The traffic situation is already terrible in and around Sharmans Cross Road with rush hour gridlock affecting people going to and from work and schools. Their safety could be compromised and their health affected by traffic pollution. There will be more demand for on-street parking spaces nearby; this is already a source of distress for some residents. GP surgeries are already overstretched. 167 extra homes will put even more pressure on NHS resources. Local schools are already full; extra families will put even more pressure on a stretched system.
Q25	Andrew Harries [4160]		Objection to Site 18: - Existing heavy congestion on Streetsbrook Road/Sharmans Cross Road junction and problems near school at Woodlea Drive/Sharmans Cross Road junction
Q25	Andrew Robbins [4162]		Traffic/Access etc area around site is already very busy Area already suffers from poor drainage Inadequate parking spaces already - especially for Arden Tennis Club
Q25	Andy Talliss [4415]		Development will increase the issues with parking/traffic and safety concerns. There is already congestion and gridlock in peak hours. School/Medical facilities are already oversubscribed and further development will increase degradation of services. Flooding on Sharmans Cross Road and gardens in Beaminster Road already a problem, the drainage systems are not equipped to cope with additional usage from an additional 67-100 families
Q25	Angela Southall [3992]		General Infrastructure issues including traffic increase, parking, drainage, schools and doctors and distance from amenities.
Q25	Ashi Bentley [5544]		Inadequate medical and school capacity to support the increase in population. Questionable whether drainage system could cope given recent flooding on Sharman's Cross Road.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	B B Tran [4186]		<p>Objection to site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of much needed sports facility - Current traffic on Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road junction already gridlocked in the morning(7:45-9:00 am). - Increased traffic will harm pedestrians and cyclists, and endanger children walking to school - Arden Club could lose 75 parking spaces and further exacerbate parking issues in the area - Increased air pollution - Existing provision of medical and school facilities is inadequate
Q25	Barbara Dennis [4088]		<p>I am concerned about all the extra cars turning into Sharmans Cross Road. It is already a nightmare with cars parking near the school at the beginning and end of the day, with buses and cars trying to get through. The junction with Streetsbrook Road is already a dangerous junction with queues at busy times.</p> <p>There is no extra capacity in local schools, no infant school near by, and already overcrowded medical centres. Buses don't run often and the train station is 25-30mins walk away.</p>
Q25	Barbara Hall [4361]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of sporting facilities in the area - Increased Traffic and Pollution - Parking - Flooding - Loss of TPO trees and habitat for wildlife - Schools and Medical Centres oversubscribed
Q25	Barbara Haste [3969]		<p>Objection to site 18</p> <p>infrastructure is inadequate to cope with additional homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increased Traffic and Pollution, in an area where traffic is already heavily congested - Schools and Medical Centres are already oversubscribed
Q25	Carolyn Ostler [4428]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Substantial increase volume of traffic leading to increased congestion, especially at the junction of Sharman's cross/streetsbrook/stonar park/Dorchester roads and outside sharmans cross junior school. - Question capacity at local Sharmans Cross school? If not, children will have to be driven to further schools. See point above. - Strain on existing facilities - schools, doctors, dentist etc. - More parking chaos at Prospect Road shops. - Loss of wildlife habitat. - Loss of local sports facilities

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Catherine Williams [3650]		Local resources are already under strain and over subscribed. Traffic is already at dangerously high levels in this area especially around Streetsbrook Road. The parking and extra cars will only add to this. Will they be including a new school or medical surgery in this development? As these local resource are already under strain and over subscribed.
Q25	Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]		The Plan needs a more objective and detailed review of available infrastructure in the two settlements [of CDB & HIA]. The Primary schools and doctors surgeries in Hampton in Arden and Yew Tree Lane are full, whilst Catherine de Barnes has no provision. Infrastructure for Site 16 wholly inadequate as public transport, education/health/shopping facilities, drainage, roads, junctions and footpaths inadequate and if addressed would greatly reduce capacity.
Q25	Coldland Colts FC (Mr Paul Fielding) [5118]		At present there are three clubs all adjacent to each other, Coldlands Colts, Hampton and Glades. All three use Lugtrout Lane to enter the grounds (albeit Coldlands Colts and Hampton is off Field Lane). We are concerned that the extra housing would mean that we have further traffic issues along Lugtrout lane
Q25	Colin Davis [3352]		Damson Parkway needs to be dual carriage way from Solihull bypass A41 to the A45, to take the extra traffic from new homes, and JLR.
Q25	Councillor J Tildesley [2119]		I believe strongly that the town centre has the opportunity for some really new and inspirational living accommodation... I believe the potential is for hundreds of additional houses to be built within the immediate area of the town centre. We should be protecting our mature suburbs and looking to develop those available brownfield sites in the town centre.
Q25	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Tentative objection due to scant information. Solihull Town Centre Masterplan needed to be included here, as contribution can make to housing provision should be context within which other sites are considered. Town Centre offers sustainable/active transport that other areas cannot, is of key strategic importance for the successful deployment of UK Central, and opportunity for housing for young people/revitalisation of High Street. Glad Solihull Station not moving. Need to see details for Cranmore and Shirley potential changes. Relocation of sportsgrounds impacts community. Shirley has taken brunt of housing recently. Need to acknowledge and work to reduce pressure on this area.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	David Chamberlin [4502]		Such a level of new building would create a significant increase in traffic flow and concomitant parking problems in and around Sharman Cross Road. Any idea that the traffic problem could be alleviated by running a road out on to Winterbourne Road would be total folly, as well as be damaging / fatal to the future prospects of a first class tennis club. There would also be significant new pressure on medical and school capacity, which are already under strain.
Q25	Derek Goodban [4204]		Objection to Site 18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing traffic congestion, parking and highway safety issues for all road users - Danger to cyclists and children walking to local junior school - Numerous accidents at Sharmans Cross/Streebsbrook Road junction - Lack of sporting facilities in the area - Loss of green space, trees and wildlife - Existing flooding issues on Sharmans Cross road during periods of heavy rain - School & medical facilities oversubscribed
Q25	Doug Rawkins [4089]		Increased volumes of traffic moving in/out of Site 18 via a single point, most likely turning right towards town centre, increasing gridlock at Sharmans Cross Rd/Streebsbrook Road junction. No plans in place to improve the four way junction. Any increase in traffic may adversely affect emergency vehicle movements. Inadequate school & medical facilities. What plans are there to increase capacity in local schools, junior and senior, or number of local GP surgeries which would be required to cope with the influx of families? Existing drainage on Sharmans Cross Road struggles to cope in heavy rain. Development would exacerbate that situation.
Q25	Dr Linda Parsons [3849]		I notice a large number of persistently vacant offices in central Solihull. There should be a compulsory requirement for any offices vacant after say a year to be changed to living accommodation. The same could be applied to vacant shops.
Q25	Dr P J M Sloan [4155]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development would worsen traffic and parking problems in the area. - There would be inadequate medical and school facilities for the proposed increased population. - The development would put extra strain on already stretched drainage and flood

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Dr Paul Rylah [5503]		I fully support improving transport links - though am very sceptical that congestion can be eased through more people using public transport. Great idea , does sometimes work, but these kind of ideas have been banded around many times before, like restricting the size of Work car parks to encourage people to commute using public transport. But it rarely worked and just pushed traffic and parking on to neighbouring streets. So yes, let's improve the commute (with parking) to and from solihull, but don't presume most will not arrive by car. And think in the same way for Knowle!
Q25	Dr Phillipa Ann Roberts [3993]		Infrastructure is inadequate to cope with this scale of development. The drains and sewers along Sharmans Cross Road are relatively old and were not built for this increased density of housing. We were perhaps lucky last summer with hot dry weather but flooding along the road near Sharmans Cross School usually occurs each year when there are several days of rain. There are also hard pressed local GP surgeries where it is increasingly difficult to obtain appointments.
Q25	Eric D Vanes [4148]		<p>Objection to site 18</p> <p>infrastructure is inadequate to cope with additional homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased Traffic and Pollution - Parking - Flooding - Schools and Medical Centres - Loss of trees
Q25	Evan Winter [4205]		<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Schools cannot cope with additional population (Sharmans Cross or Tudor Grange) - Medical facilities are already stretched to breaking point - Traffic already extremely slow to get onto Streetsbrook Road from Sharmans Cross or Dorchester Road - Highway safety issues for cyclists and pedestrians, especially children getting to school - Loss of sporting facilities
Q25	Frances Cook [4696]		<p>The roads surrounding site 16 are frequently congested with traffic, and could not cope with the cars associated with 600 new dwellings.</p> <p>Field lane is too narrow to be useful.</p>
Q25	Frances Friel [4156]		<p>Objection to site 18</p> <p>Infrastructure is inadequate to cope with additional homes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing traffic issues at Sharman's Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road junction and Danford Lane island. - Parking on Sharman's Cross Road - Flooding on Sharman's Cross Road - Schools and Medical Centres oversubscribed in Sharman's Cross Road area

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q25	Guy Turley [4464]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of sporting facility - should be reinstated as a sporting venue - Highway safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists, especially for children at Junior School - Traffic congestion and parking issues on Sharmans Cross and surrounding roads - Loss of green space and wildlife habitat
Q25	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Laurence Holmes) [6110]		<p>Important that IDP is based on up-to-date and robust evidence to provide clarity for developers and ensure S106 contributions are CIL-compliant.</p> <p>For Site 16, infrastructure delivery will be focused on delivering improvements to promote access and connectivity between the site and the town centre, and by achieving a policy-compliant level of affordable housing on site.</p> <p>Subject to appropriate highway evidence being assessed at planning application stage, off-site improvement works to which contributions could be made include those that are planned at Yew Tree Lane/A41/Hampton Lane signalised junction, as highlighted in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
Q25	H E & Mrs J L Biggs [4685]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of sporting facility - Potential for environmental and ecological damage - Add to further traffic congestion - Extra pressure on drains - Local schools and medical centres oversubscribed
Q25	Hazel Truman [4368]		<p>Objection to Site 16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of green and open space - Permanent loss of sports ground - Poor drainage and flooding - Traffic -Sharmans Cross Road is already an extremely busy road - Highway safety issues for pedestrians, could discourage children walking to school - Increased Pollution - The parking for the Club will be insufficient at peak times and people park on the road

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Ian & Janet Thomas [3755]		<p>We should be encouraging sport not decreasing land available for it, for health reasons.</p> <p>We are already struggling with pressures on schools and medical facilities in the area, this level of development would have an adverse effect on the local Schools and GP Surgeries.</p> <p>Traffic and parking is an issue in this area, increasing vehicle numbers would be detrimental to the environment in Solihull.</p>
Q25	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	<p>the Council states it is encouraging people to use more public transport as well as cycle and walk. While this is a sensible approach, the Council must be pragmatic and ensure that sufficient capacity is created within sites for parking that is required. Just because parking isn't provided does not mean future residents will not own cars and the Council should be mindful of this when attributing numbers to allocated sites.</p>
Q25	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	<p>Overall IM is in agreement with the infrastructure requirements set out within the consultation document; however they would suggest that more detailed consideration needs to be given to improving connectivity to and from the Town Centre as part of a wider strategic plan for investment to support economic growth within the Borough. In particular, detailed consideration should be given to improving connections between the Town Centre and the UK Central 'Hub', and the opportunity to reduce reliance on travel by car should be explored further to enable the opportunity for the redevelopment of existing car parks.</p>
Q25	J A Woodall [4683]		<p>Objection to site 18</p> <p>infrastructure is inadequate to cope with additional homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increased Traffic and Pollution -Parking - Flooding - Schools and Medical Centres
Q25	James Rogers [4223]		<p>Development will result in local amenities such as GP's, Dentists, School places etc being even more stretched than now.</p> <p>There is a serious lack of sporting facilities in the area, especially for younger people.</p>
Q25	Jayna Thakrar [5829]		<p>Traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross Road</p> <p>Inadequate school capacities to accommodate any future housing</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities.</p>
Q25	Jennifer Kentish [4033]		<p>Traffic congestion along Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Poor surface water drainage around Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Schools and medical facilities are already oversubscribed.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Jill Allen [5810]		Permanent loss of sporting facilities. Increased traffic and associated pollution and potential accidents Insufficient parking. Sharman's Cross Road is already subject to flooding during heavy rain. Development will exacerbate this. Insufficient schools and medical services already and further development in this area can only cause a degradation of services for existing residents.
Q25	Joanne Brindley [4150]		Objection to site 18 infrastructure is inadequate to cope with additional homes -Increased Traffic and Pollution -Parking - Flooding - Schools and Medical Centres
Q25	John Bentley [4236]		Objection to Site 18: - Poor drainage - Existing traffic congestion at the junctions of Sharmans Cross Road, Streetsbrook Road, Stonor Park Road and Dorchester Road at peak times. - Parking issues outside of Sharmans Cross school - Inadequate medical and school capacity
Q25	John Gee [4094]		Solihull is desperately short of sporting pitches, with several in this locality being lost to development over recent years.
Q25	John Handford [4032]		CAPACITY OF MEDICAL AND DENTAL FACILITIES: The number of GP and dental facilities in the area is very limited - particularly GPs. Such a vast increase in housing as proposed is going to stretch the already inadequate availability of such services beyond acceptable limits. Irrespective, of whether new residents are able, or not, to sign up to such local services they, inevitably, will travel by car - adding to the same issues as in (1) above.
Q25	John R Smith [4133]		- Objection to Site 18 - Concern for loss of sports ground and open space - Additional road traffic & increased congestion will overwhelm current road system - School places, medical facilities, storm water and sewerage systems will not cope - Concern

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Julia Williams [4244]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of valuable sporting facility. - Existing parking issues, especially around school, and limited parking proposed by development - Existing traffic congestion on Streetsbrook Road and Sharmans Cross Road in the morning and evening rush hour and this will be further exacerbated by cars entering and leaving the development. - Local school oversubscribed <p>Negative impact on local facilities</p>
Q25	K Sunner [4351]		<p>Primary schools and doctor's surgeries in both Hampton-in-Arden and Yew Tree Lane are already at capacity and Catherine de Barnes has neither. The infrastructure is unable to meet the pressure from additional dwellings. No public transport along Lugtrout Lane and that along Hampton Lane is inadequate.</p> <p>Inadequate roads serve the proposed site. Lugtrout Lane and Field Lane are narrow and rural in character which makes them unsuitable for increased traffic. The junctions either end of Lugtrout Lane do not have the capacity to handle the additional traffic that would be generated. There is no footpath along most of Lugtrout Lane.</p>
Q25	Kalpesh Thakrar [4468]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Huge shortage in NHS funding and removing sporting facilities will lead to further compound the obesity levels and strain on NHS - Added pressure on infrastructure - Existing traffic congestion and parking issues - TPOs should be retained <p>Poor drainage and flooding in area</p>
Q25	Karen Clarke [4165]		<p>Sharman's Cross Junction with Stoner/Dorchester Rd and Streetsbrook Rd is already extremely busy in the morning peak. Crossing the road is difficult. On-street parking issues.</p> <p>Primary and secondary schools already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Local shops and health care facilities struggle to cope with demand.</p>
Q25	Keith Dennis [4346]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insufficient sporting grounds in Solihull, falling in the league tables. - Loss of sporting facilities - Increased traffic will exacerbate existing issues
Q25	Laurence & Rachel Bannister [6298]		<p>Existing flooding on Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities at a time when there is an existing shortage. Development will overburden schools and medical facilities which are already oversubscribed.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Louise Gee [4200]		The local area is desperately short of sports fields.
Q25	M Lopez [6014]		I still believe there is a huge gap in the consideration of how residents can travel from Solihull train station to International Station without having travel via Birmingham. Is this possible by creating a new track from Widney Manor Station that could follow the motorway route to junction 6? Not everyone wants to drive to International or travel by bus, if they are taking luggage or bags with them.
Q25	Malcolm Trueman [4538]		Flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road and lack of sporting facilities in the area.
Q25	Maria Cooper [6295]		Lack of existing sports facilities. Strain on available school places and doctors surgeries which are already over subscribed. Traffic would be heavier around all local roads which at peak times are already under stress with long tail backs
Q25	Martin Gollogly [4192]		The traffic is already an absolute nightmare and is clearly getting worse. Traffic from Blossomfield Road typically goes up to around 56/58 Sharmans Cross Road in one direction and from the Junior School all the way to the Sharmans Cross roundabout in the other. The traffic around Blossomfield School is so bad that drivers now regularly drive on the pavement to get past. Additional development will generate even more traffic, making crossing the road difficult and unsafe. Parking is already inadequate. The local school near Sharmans Cross would need to have yet another intake added.
Q25	Mary Jones [3702]		Land earmarked for sporting facilities should be protected and used for such purposes. Local medical centres and school services already struggling with numbers and would inevitably be diminished.
Q25	Michael Hannon [4429]		Objection to Site 18. - Sports pitches must not be lost - Strain on oversubscribed schools & GPs - Increased road traffic and congestion, pollution and safety near a school - particularly Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road junction, traffic queues from Woodside Way up to Woodlea Road. Will be issues on Winterbourne Road/Welcombe Grove - Significant impact on wildlife and environment. Loss of green spaces

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Michael J Foster [3654]		<p>Major concern is that there is no room to build new schools or create new medical facilities in an area already oversubscribed to accommodate increased housing in this location.</p> <p>Existing flooding problems and development will add to these.</p> <p>Existing traffic congestion and road system will not cope with additional traffic. Risks to traffic, pedestrians and children will increase.</p> <p>Loss of sports pitches when Solihull has responsibility to protect and Borough poorly provided for compared with other areas</p>
Q25	Michael Joiner [6207]		<p>Site has been used for social and sporting for years, area has been subject to speculation since demise of rugby club, this would result in the loss of this sporting facility.</p> <p>Such a valuable natural facility is rare and should be cherished, once lost it will never come back. Wildlife, trees and open spaces to enjoy fresh air will be lost</p> <p>Road networks are already stretched and there is concern over the lack of facilities such as doctors and space at local schools. There are other more suitable areas for housing. Additional traffic will not only be residents but service vehicles, deliveries.</p> <p>Danger of losing the title 'Urbs in Rure' for Solihull due to this type of development</p>
Q25	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q25	Miss Nisha Jassal [6174]		<p>Dense development would add a considerable burden on the surrounding roads, drainage, infrastructure and amenities.</p> <p>Parking and traffic would be intolerable.</p> <p>Solihull is already struggling severely with demand for things like GP appointments and school places. Trying to get an appointment with a GP can take weeks</p> <p>Crime rates in Solihull are already high - dense developments increase populations locally but there is no policing in the borough to cope with that.</p>
Q25	Miss Shivangee Maurya [5241]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lots of congestion in this area at peak times, more housing will make the problem worse - Loss of pitches, there will be none in the locality
Q25	Moira Keeble [5804]		<p>Already existing traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross Road and potential for future accidents.</p> <p>Existing flooding and drainage issues exacerbated.</p> <p>Local schools and surgeries are at maximum capacity.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Mr & Mrs David Hull [3876]		<p>Objection to site 18</p> <p>infrastructure is inadequate to cope with additional homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increased Traffic, dangers to pedestrians and Pollution -Parking - Schools and Medical Centres - inadequate provision for sport and recreation
Q25	Mr & Mrs F L & Mrs M E Miller [5713]		<p>existing draining system would be unable to cope</p> <p>existing highways network would not be able to cope with additional traffic</p>
Q25	Mr & Mrs Howard & Susan Jones [6231]		<p>The site has a covenant which restricts use to sporting use only. This should be maintained.</p> <p>The density would be 5 times that of the surrounding area, diminishing its character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>Parking in the surrounding area would become a nightmare.</p> <p>There are a number of tree preservation orders in operation.</p> <p>The Victorian drainage system is already fully stretched, and would, almost certainly, break down completely if forced to cope with an increase in capacity.</p> <p>The existing medical/educational facilities would be sore pressed to cope with the influx that would result from proposed residential development.</p>
Q25	Mr & Mrs Jewitt [4394]		<p>The schools in Solihull are already over subscribed, as are the hospitals, dentists doctors and colleges.</p> <p>Already flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road. The drainage systems are not equipped to cope with additional development.</p> <p>Additional traffic and issues with parking. Concerned from a safety perspective (including children walking to and from school) and also the increase congestion and gridlock in the morning and evening.</p> <p>Lack of sporting facilities in the area</p>
Q25	Mr Christopher Allen [3031]		<p>Schools and medical centres - there are insufficient schools and medical services already and further development in this area can only cause a degradation of services for existing residents.</p>
Q25	Mr Christopher Hall [3220]		<p>Schools and medical centres are already oversubscribed, and development at Site 18 will further increase demand leading to a degradation of services for residents.</p>
Q25	Mr David Carter [5404]		<p>I see that the Supplementary Consultation Site Assessments document designates the Green Belt fields on one side of Widney Manor Road (between 70- 120WMR) as RED ie not to be included in Plan because any housing development would have severe negative impacts. I totally agree that this land should remain undeveloped green belt (Rus in urbe).</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Mr Derek Wright [5705]		I am also concerned about the amount of traffic in the area. At present during rush hour or JLR shift changes Damson Parkway is heavily congested. Also with the proposed additional development by JLR next to Solihull Moors this can only get worse. Also how will the local doctors surgery and schools cope with such an increase in the local population? Surely these will need to be addressed before any proposed development of site 16.
Q25	Mr Francis Ryan [3584]		Site 16 was originally rejected within the 2012 SHLAA for reasons which remain unchanged today. The infrastructure required to support a development of this size is totally inadequate and remains unchanged. Hampton Lane in particular, is already severely congested even during weekend periods and the impact that further traffic will have will completely change the character and relationship that Catherine De Barnes currently enjoys with Solihull Town Centre and surrounding areas.
Q25	Mr Giles Cook [5299]		Field lane rural character will not allow meaningful traffic. Traffic on all boundary roads is currently excessive. Traffic measures are required
Q25	Mr John Allen [6191]		I object to development on green belt land. There are many brown field and derelict sites in Birmingham that should be developed before requiring Solihull to share their housing requirement. Solihull Council should make forceful representations on this point. The majority of the roads around the surrounding areas of Solihull are inadequate to cope with additional traffic. The whole character of the area is under threat from the scale of the proposed developments
Q25	Mr John Southall [2995]		General Infrastructure issues including traffic increase, parking, drainage, schools and doctors and distance from amenity.
Q25	Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]		Need to consider: Flood risk and mitigation Densities and plans drawn up to meet needs of the local population. Ensure sufficient funding to enable schools and medical practices to increase capacity or for new facilities Schools and medical facilities included in masterplans where necessary Brownfield sites considered first in accordance with WMCA policy and use of green belt as last resort Integration of green space and play areas, and incorporate views of local residents in design of developments.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Mr Mark Phillips [4103]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Important to retain for sporting use, are of excellent quality and would be difficult to replace - Concerns regarding the impact of development on the woodland SINC at Pow Grove
Q25	Mr Mick Westman [4056]		<p>Increased volumes of traffic moving in/out of Site 18, most likely turning right out of site towards town, increasing gridlock on Sharmans Cross Rd which is already dangerous, Streetsbrook Road, and the inevitable increase of traffic on side roads.</p>
Q25	Mr Neil Groutage [5281]		<p>Local amenities such as doctors and schools can not cope with current demand. Traffic congestion at key times is terrible with Lugtrout Lane used as a cut-through due to additional congestion on Hampton Lane. Concern for current wildlife bats, deer, birds. ASB/Security concerns in open copse area if boundary not secured.</p>
Q25	Mr Nicholas Carter [5720]		<p>There are insufficient local facilities for schools and medical provision so more homes will simply put extra pressure on these resources. Traffic at Sharmans Cross Rd and Streetsbrook Rd junction is one of the worst in the borough for congestion and danger, particularly where Stonor Park Rd and Dorchester Rd also join Streetsbrook Road. In AM/PM rush hour there is significant congestion which causes some drivers to take risks and pull out dangerously onto Streetsbrook Rd. This would become far worse if there were a significant number of additional drivers trying to get out of a new estate.</p>
Q25	Mr Philip Harrison [5781]		<p>Solihull needs more investment in recreational and sporting facilities, not less. There is already inadequate parking in the locality and the surrounding roads would be overloaded by the additional traffic. Loss of trees and other green infrastructure. The local infrastructure would not cope with the increased number of residents (schools, GP surgeries, Solihull hospital, drainage, police, fire etc).</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Mr Steven Webb [2960]		<p>The term Green Belt Enhancement is almost laughable. Who comes up with this type of terminology! What it actually means is using existing Green Belt, redefining the boundaries which is totally pointless as in the next decade or so it will just be eaten away at and 'Enhanced' again.</p> <p>Traffic around the centre and all surrounding roads is frankly a nightmare at commute times. Without major demolition of existing properties I see absolutely no chance of sorting this out.</p> <p>Medical services in area will be unable to cope with additional population.</p>
Q25	Mr Stuart Mason [5240]		<p>local roads are gridlocked with existing traffic and further development of all the proposed sites will make traffic worse.</p> <p>Current schools in the area are at over capacity for pupils. Lugtrout Lane/Hampton Lane is part of the Meriden Gap. Any new housing development in this area will be detrimental to the area</p>
Q25	Mr Tony Moon [4964]		<p>Access to a modern , well presented town centre is esental for local areas, fully support the plan</p>
Q25	Mrs A L Tran [4231]		<p>Objection to site 18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of much needed sports facility - Current traffic on Sharmans Cross Road/Streetsbrook Road junction already gridlocked in the morning(7:45-9:00 am). - Increased traffic will harm pedestrians and cyclists, and endanger children walking to school - Arden Club could lose 75 parking spaces and further exacerbate parking issues in the area - Increased air pollution <p>Existing provision of medical and school facilities is inadequate</p>
Q25	Mrs Beryl Hukin [4014]		<p>Traffic , parking and flooding issues. Drainage inadequate and development will increase risk of flooding.</p> <p>School and medical facilities inadequate.</p>
Q25	Mrs D B Rainbow [6283]		<p>We do not have the school capacity & medical coverage</p> <p>There would be an increase in traffic in the area.</p>
Q25	Mrs Fiona Somerville [5786]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Inadequate parking in the locality would intensify additional on road parking in the area. * Existing local infrastructure, such as GP surgeries & schools, which are already overstretched, would not cope with the increase in residents.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Mrs Julie Westman [4074]		Presently Sharmans Cross Road, Streetsbrook Road and Dorchester Road are gridlocked at various times in the day. All the side roads get used as a rat run and they are not capable of taking increased traffic. I am also concerned about the demand of new housing on already over stretched facilities. All the local schools and medical centres are over subscribed and further development will increase demand leading to a degradation of services for residents.
Q25	Mrs Kitty Cosgrove [6277]		Existing parking issues would be exacerbated. Medical and school capacity are at their limits.
Q25	Mrs P Goodban [4405]		Objection to Site 18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of sporting facility - Loss of valuable open space - Detrimental to the local wildlife and ecosystem - Existing flooding issues due to heavy rainfall - Will inevitably bring an increase in traffic turning on to a road which is already heavily used especially at peak times- as well as with the traffic from the school' Recent accident - Tuesday 12th March - Sharmans Cross Road - approx. 6.30pm - between Woodside Way and Arden club exit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School oversubscribed - Safety of pedestrians will be jeopardised
Q25	Mrs Patricia Harris [4679]		Objection to Site 18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased traffic and pollution. Dangerous for children attending Sharmans Cross School, traffic situation is horrendous at school times. - Highways infrastructure inadequate and parking issues - Area subject to flooding - Schools and medical facilities cannot cope - Loss of sports facility
Q25	Mrs S A tongue [5762]		The sports ground covenant should be maintained. The site contributes to the urbs in rure character of Solihull. The tennis club is well used. Area has Victorian drains and will be unable to cope with additional development. Already difficult to access doctors dentists and schools. Impact of additional traffic and parking on already congested roads. Brownfield sites should be used first and houses do not look like they will be for first time buyers/renters which is what is needed.
Q25	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		It is entirely appropriate that land currently used for business/retail purposes is recycled and used for the apparent housing need. Stop developing car showrooms and expensive retirement homes and use for affordable housing.
Q25	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Sound sensible

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Mrs Zoe Edwards [2907]		Solihull cannot cope with the traffic levels as they are currently, additional development will destroy further the quality of life within Solihull if more traffic, be it cars or public transport is added to the already congested roads.
Q25	Ms Sue Holden [5685]		Traffic near Sharmans Cross road is excessively high Not enough amenities to cater for an influx of population in the area (site 18) - Surgery is stretched Traffic is creating a health and safety issue Sharmans Cross junior is and will be oversubscribed The local convenience shops on Prospect Lane do not have the capacity Pavements as well as roads on Sharmans Cross Road are perilously overcrowded Crime has risen in the area
Q25	Neil Eaton [4181]		Objection to Site 18: - Increased housing will put additional pressure on existing traffic and parking problems in the area. - Pow Coppice wildlife site should be protected from adjacent development.
Q25	Network Rail (Ms Diane Clarke) [2251]		Network Rail is a statutory consultee for any planning applications within 10 metres of relevant railway land (as the Rail Infrastructure Managers for the railway, set out in Article 16 of the Development Management Procedure Order) and for any development likely to result in a material increase in the volume or a material change in the character of traffic using a level crossing over a railway (as the Rail Network Operators, set out in Schedule 4 (J) of the Development Management Procedure Order.
Q25	Network Rail (Ms Diane Clarke) [2251]		Redevelopment of Solihull Railway Station - Chiltern Railways are aware of the proposal and will liaise with the council.
Q25	Oliver Turley [4333]		Objection to Site 18: - Loss of sports facility - Traffic Congestion will increase leading to increased dangers to pedestrians and cyclists - Parking Congestion- The very high density of housing proposed would lead to parking congestion on site and nearby roads. Concern for schoolchildren who walk/cycle to Sharmans Cross Junior School. The Council's Road Safety Team has been working with the school to promote walking and cycling to school. - Environment- The area is a well-established green space with many mature trees and areas of wildlife

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Open Spaces Society (Mr Richard Lloyd) [5451]		<p>Master plan approach is welcomed, but should be extended to all part of the Borough. the master plans need to become more tightly defined during the further development of the Local Plan. Should show how the policies elsewhere in the Local Plan are to be implemented in each specific site. Should be clear allocation and protection of areas for public access, should be secured in perpetuity by the dedication of the land as a Village Green, or by dedication of access rights under section 16 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. There is no mention in the Draft Plan of the designation of Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF para 99</p> <p>In terms of green belt enhancements Potential improvements should be seen in the context of the agricultural use of much of the land, and of the prevailing Solihull Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2016 (ROWIP). Best possible standards and practice should be applied for the physical state of the path network. Registration of unrecorded access rights should be encouraged and expedited. The Local Plan should also define how funding derived from developers will be applied to the other aspects of enhancements to the Green Belt.</p>
Q25	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		<p>Objection to development of Site 16 East of Solihull between Lugtrout Lane and Hampton Lane within existing green belt. No additional school places for primary or secondary education are proposed.</p> <p>Protection of two Heritage Assets (Field Farm and 237 Lugtrout Lane) and their setting is essential.</p> <p>Developers should guarantee that Sports Facilities (Coldland Colts Boys FC) shall be relocated prior to residential development. No consideration has been given to mains services to proposed housing, including electricity, gas, water supply, mains drainage and telecommunications. Section 106 agreement with developer to improve Site of Special Scientific Interest along Grand Union Canal.</p>
Q25	Paul Ponsonby [4738]		<p>Local roads are already congested, more so at "school run" times. This will be exacerbated.</p> <p>Pressures on sewers, drains and roadside parking should prevent the proposal alone. The area cannot support any further over-development.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities which will be needed for the next generation of children.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Paul Thompson [5836]		Currently Solihull becomes grid locked at certain times of the day and adding a substantial development would cause significant environmental/ other issues. Need to keep our green spaces
Q25	Peter Morgan [6282]		The infrastructure of Solihull already fails to cope with the volume of housing, traffic and residents' needs. The proposed housing development (site 18) would significantly compound this problem which detracts from the quality of life for local residents.
Q25	Peter Quinn [5616]		The need for additional dwellings generated the need for recreational facilities and that is what this land is covenanted for. High density housing on the site would add to existing traffic chaos on Sharmans Cross Road at certain times of the morning and evening.
Q25	Phillip Ellis [4183]		Objection to Site 18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for sporting facilities in the area - Existing medical and school facilities are inadequate - Existing parking problems and dense traffic, particularly at peak periods
Q25	Phillip Leyland [3701]		Development will create further parking problems in an area already besieged with traffic issues, create further drainage/flooding problems in an area of Sharmans Cross which already has severe drainage. Results in further pressure of an already strained medical and schooling facilities. Impact on existing sports club.
Q25	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Site 407 is located in an area where the provision of affordable housing is identified in the Draft Plan as being challenging. Given this is one of the most sustainable locations within the Borough, the reliance on windfalls is not an acceptable approach to delivering affordable housing and deliverable sites should be identified to meet the well-publicised affordability issues. In light of this need, and the lack of suitable alternatives, there are clearly exceptional circumstances for the release of our Client's site (407) for a 100% affordable housing scheme.
Q25	Raj Loi [3132]		The increased housing will mean further schools/medical centres/dentists and other support facilities being required - how is this manageable? The amount of traffic that runs down the main roads is already at bursting at rush hour, the increased residents will surely see the place come to a standstill.
Q25	Richard Burbidge [4263]		Objection to Site 18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of local sporting facility - Drainage and flooding issues - due to Victorian drains - Parking capacity is an issue - Lack of capacity of medical facilities - Concerned about increased demand on school places

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Richard Young [4484]		Loss of sporting facilities. Existing road network around the site is unsuitable for handling the increased levels in traffic. Further pressure on local services such as schools and medical services.
Q25	Roger Clench [4213]		Objection to Site 18: - Site should be retained for sporting use - There would be inadequate medical and school capacity. - Issue with parking - Drainage concerns. - Need to preserve wildlife and recreational areas
Q25	Roger Chapman [3972]		Too few green spaces in Solihull. Traffic volumes will significantly increase and quiet roads around the area will become congested and potentially dangerous. Parking will become a major problem. The whole area is already on a knife edge and no doubt the effect of this development will have added complications which the Council will be faced with in issues of flooding
Q25	Roger Flood [3937]		The local Schools and Medical Services are already bursting at the seam and would be unable to cope with extra personnel. Many unaccompanied children walk or go on scooters to school and the extra traffic would make them more vulnerable. To make sure the children are safe, their parents might then decide to take them to school by car causing even more traffic problems in an already congested area.
Q25	Roger Hopper [4132]		- Objection to Site 18 - Existing parking and traffic congestion issues - Medical facilities and schools already oversubscribed - Lack of suitable and sufficient sports facilities in the Borough
Q25	Ron Edwards [4237]		Objection to Site 18: - Inadequate school and medical capacity at the moment in this area. - Open space important for wildlife - Drainage/flooding already a problem - Concern about air quality - Traffic chaos outside the school - Loss of sporting facility
Q25	Rosconn Strategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q25	Royden Hukin [4163]		Objection to Site 18: - Lack of sports facilities in Solihull - Existing flooding issues - Existing congestion at peak hours on Sharmans Road/Strettsbrook Road junction - Bus routes made traffic issues worse - Pressure on oversubscribed medical facilities and school places

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Sarah La Touche [4265]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of sporting facility - Shortage of sports grounds in Solihull - Serious congestion already, and gridlock at peak times - Highway safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists - Sharmans Cross Junior School already full and expanded to 4 form entry - Existing parking issues - would be exacerbated by increased housing and loss of c.70 spaces at Tennis Club
Q25	Severn Trent Water (Elaine Ring) [6241]		<p>Severn Trent Water response:</p> <p>Results of our high level sewer capacity assessment highlights some possible risks of the proposed development on the sewerage and surface water network. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead.</p> <p>High Impact Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Moat Lane, Vulcan Road <p>Medium Impact Sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - East of Olton Baptist Church - Solihull Town Centre - Lugtrout Lane - Football Ground east of Bramcote Drive - Land Damson Parkway - UK Central Hub/HS2 interchange * Lugtrout Lane
Q25	Sharon Anne Burbidge [4264]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of sporting facility - Impact on the Victorian drains will become worse - Exacerbate existing parking issues - Increased population would add strain to medical facilities - Local schools oversubscribed - Concern about future of Arden Tennis Club - should not be lost - Loss of trees and wildlife

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Shaun Friel [4199]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Drainage system is struggling to cope with current demand; often flooding at Sharmans Cross/Streetsbrook Road junction - Local schools, especially primary schools, doctors and dentists are already oversubscribed - Existing traffic congestion issues due to development of Touchwood, continuous development of Blossomfield Road - Access road next to Sharmans Cross school will be added danger to children getting to/from school - Loss of much needed sports facility -Increased Traffic and Pollution -Parking - Flooding
Q25	Stephen Clarke [4164]		<p>Traffic on Sharmans Cross Junction in morning rush hour is already bad - extra homes built in the area will exacerbate this. This will impact pedestrian safety on the roads</p> <p>Extra homes will make parking problems worse in the area (most homes have 2 vehicles)</p> <p>Schooling is already oversubscribed in the area - extra housing will add to the problem</p> <p>The local shops and health care facilities struggle to cope with parking demand.</p>
Q25	Steven Kentish [4005]		<p>Several infrastructure concerns relating to this development.</p> <p>Schools and local medical facilities are already over-subscribed and development will place significant further burden on school places and access to medical care leading to a loss of quality and safety of those services, and have a serious detrimental impact on those services for existing local residents.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities despite current shortage of pitches and sports facilities in the area, and SMBC has a statutory duty to ensure lost pitches are replaced with facilities of an equivalent standard and accessibility is not reduced.</p> <p>Drainage and flooding issues in Sharmans Cross Road.</p>
Q25	Stewart Millman [4050]		<p>By increasing the housing in the Sharman's Cross area will significantly increase the traffic. Currently there is a fundamental problem with traffic volume along Sharman's Cross Road and with the junction with Streetsbrook Road. During rush hour it is nose to tail for 1.5 - 2 hours causing pollution due to the stationary traffic. During school run time Sharman's Cross is quite dangerous due the the parked traffic along the road, reducing it to one lane. Therefore in combination with school runs and rush hour the whole Sharman's Cross/Streetsbrook Rd area is both dangerous and polluting.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q25	Sue McDermott [4703]		Sharmans Cross Road / Streetsbrook Road are gridlocked every morning. Pedestrians and cyclists are posed with increasing safety hazards. Blossomfield Infants, Streetbrook Infants, St. Alphege Infants are over subscribed. Sharmans Cross Juniors is the only KS2 School in the area. Tudor Grange has had an appeal system in place for many years. all surgeries in the area have huge waiting times for appointments. Youngsters could walk, bus or travel by train to this venue. They now have to be driven to out of town locations. Sharmans Cross Road can be subject to flooding during heavy rain. The ancient drains can not cope.
Q25	Surinder Jassal [4381]		Objection to Site 18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of sporting facilities in the area - Loss of green space for people and wildlife - Increase in traffic, parking issues and pollution - already very congested. - Highway safety issues for children getting to Sharmans Cross Junior School - Existing flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road - Schools and medical centres oversubscribed
Q25	Susan Sloan [4122]		- Objection to Site 18 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solihull has a dearth of playing pitches, is low in the national league tables for sports participation and needs more sport facilities - Highway infrastructure inadequate - Will exacerbate existing parking issues - Existing
Q25	Tajinder Lalli [5721]		The Council should not renege on its commitment to only use the site for sporting use and should invest in the site for the benefit of the community. Already inadequate provision for young people to play sport outside of school. Even if pitches were reprovided, new out-of-town grounds would do very little to promote sport. Pressure on existing infrastructure, in particular the school and the road. No provision for new infrastructure, for example a doctors surgery.
Q25	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q25	Vikki Sunner [4432]		Development will see the capacity of local roads (including Dorchester Road and Streetsbrook Road) exceeded. Sharmans Cross Road is heavily congested. Flooding issues. Schools in the area are already over subscribed and adding more houses would only add to this situation
Q25	West Midlands Police (Chief Constable) [5044]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The absence of positive references to the need to provide Police infrastructure undermines the delivery of safe and secure development. There should be express reference to the need for financial contributions towards additional expenditure burden placed on WM Police as a consequence of the proposed growth. Seek engagement in preparation of Concept Masterplans and policy implementation and delivery once Plan adopted.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Solihull Town Centre & Mature Suburbs			
Q26	Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]		Oppose development of Site and extension to north of Lugtrout Lane, due to loss of green belt, reduction in rural gap between urban area and Catherine de Barnes to small sliver, abandonment of defensible green belt boundary, inability of infrastructure to cope, inconsistent with Challenge E of SLP2013, contrary to 2012 SHLAA assessment which remains valid, cumulative impact with HS2, M42 Junction 6 and MSA and loss of farmland/biodiversity. Inclusion of land north of Lugtrout Lane directly affects green belt gap, increases indefensible boundary and threatens loss of remaining green belt land between Lugtrout Lane and the canal.
Q26	Coldland Colts FC (Mr Paul Fielding) [5118]		It is unclear whether or not our playing fields form part of the plans as some of the documents contradict each other. Ideally we would prefer to remain on the current site but were you to consider moving us we would prefer to retain a proximity to the existing ground and preferably would like to be part of the new development and not located elsewhere. If the outer most boundary of the new development does end adjacent to the Coldlands Colts ground then we request that a definitive boundary fence line be installed.
Q26	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Yes. The masterplan should be credited for protection of Sports facilities and also for historic buildings. It is also in a strategically significant location, in a growth corridor. With this in mind, it may be necessary to work on addressing infrastructure and public transport provision within the area.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q26	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Strategic Land and Property Team of SMBC (acting in the Council's capacity as land owner) [6043]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	<p>Supports allocation, the land does not fulfil the 5 purposes of the green belt. Release of this land would provide a sustainable location for the development of new homes to help the Borough achieve its housing requirement within the plan period and is therefore supported. Existing road infrastructure connects the site along Damson Parkway to the A41 to M6 Junction 5. Within a two mile radius are Solihull Town Centre (including Solihull Hospital, schools, college and university centre and leisure centre), Solihull Train Station, Bus stops for 5 services to Solihull, Wolverhampton, Dudley, Erdington, Sheldon and King Edward VI Camp Hill and M42 Junction 5. Due to the sites close proximity to local facilities and services it is a sustainable location for development. A vision document including technical work and master planning has been prepared by neighbouring land owners and submitted to the Draft Plan Review. Phase 1 habitat survey deemed the site is of negligible nature conservation interest. There are some habitats on site that are of increased nature conservation interest such as; native species dominated hedgerow, mature trees, semi-improved grassland, relict orchard and garden habitat. Report indicates the site has good highway connection both locally and to the wider network. The site is near Damson Parkway, A41 Solihull Bypass which leads to the M42 junction 5. Damson Parkway also leads north to Birmingham Airport along A45 and east towards M42 junction. The grade II listed buildings on field lane and Lugtrout Lane and the need to retain their setting are noted. In advance of the Submission Draft consultation SMBC are proposing to engage with other landowners to develop a comprehensive master plan for the delivery of the site.</p> <p>The site is well contained by strong, permanent defensible boundaries to the north (Lugtrout Lane) and east (Field Lane) to the south (Hampton Lane - B4102) and to the west (Damson Parkway)</p>
Q26	Frances Cook [4696]		Removing this site from the green belt will reduce the desirable green gap between Solihull and Catherine de Barnes.
Q26	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q26	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Laurence Holmes) [6110]		<p>Agree Council has adhered to an NPPF compliant approach in selecting Site 16. Site 16 will allow Solihull to expand in proportionate manner.</p> <p>Vision Document submitted with representation: Will provide policy-compliant level of affordable housing Reaffirm status of Site 16 as suitable, available and achievable. Landscape sensitivity can be mitigated, no flood risk, no statutory or local wildlife designations, no known contamination, no significant impact to heritage assets. Site enjoys good accessibility, within walking distance to bus services. St Philips submitted Masterplan: Would retain playing pitches, provide 600 dwellings, access off Pinfold Lane. Site could be built out between 2022-2028.</p>
Q26	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Support the proposed allocation of our Client's site within Site 16 for housing which, together with the rest of the proposed allocation, is estimated could deliver in total around 600 dwellings within the revised plan period to 2035. Site has defensible boundaries, provides logical extension, is highly accessible, well served by sustainable forms of transport.</p> <p>Concept Masterplan Object to potential area of ecological assessment as no evidence.</p>
Q26	Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]		<p>Oppose development of Site and extension to north of Lugtrout Lane, due to loss of green belt, reduction in rural gap between urban area and Catherine de Barnes to small sliver, abandonment of defensible green belt boundary, inability of infrastructure to cope, inconsistent with Challenge E of SLP2013, contrary to 2012 SHLAA assessment which remains valid, and cumulative impact with HS2, M42 Junction 6 and MSA.</p> <p>Inclusion of land north of Lugtrout Lane directly affects green belt gap, increases indefensible boundary and threatens loss of remaining green belt land between Lugtrout Lane and the canal.</p>
Q26	Hampton-in-Arden Society (Victoria Woodall) [5807]		<p>Strongly oppose development of Site 16 (Lugtrout Lane)</p> <p>With regard to: Protecting the Catney Gap in accordance with Challenge E of the 2013 Plan; Loss of defensible boundaries for Green Belt protection; Inability of the local infrastructure to handle the development The scale of the proposed development which will gridlock existing roads and junctions, already at capacity. The reasons given for rejecting this development in SHLAA 2012; Strongly oppose the extension of Site 16 north of Lugtrout Lane.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q26	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		<p>Historic England acknowledges the SMBC Draft Masterplan which suggests how potential future development might respond to the affected heritage assets. It will be important that assumptions are underpinned by evidence and this is available to help interested parties consider whether the proposed response is appropriate.</p> <p>Will be important for the Council to demonstrate that it has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -taken sufficient account of the evidence base to avoid or minimise harm to the significance of the affected heritage assets -attached great weight to the conservation of those assets and -had due regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of those listed
Q26	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	<p>This Site contains similar constraints to Site 1 in that it has multiple land owners and assembly issues as well as sports pitch provision. The Council should evidence that this Site is deliverable as well as showing that the sports pitches will be mitigated in line with the Revised NPPF (2019)</p>
Q26	John Maguire [3543]	Colliers International (Michael Maguire) [3542]	<p>We would agree and support the Council's draft allocation of Site 16 as a suitable, sustainable site for Urban Extension. The proposal to move the Green belt boundary to The Grand Union canal north of Lugtrout Lane provides a defensible boundary. The proposed inclusion of land on northern side of Lugtrout Lane would allow for that site to be developed at an earlier stage to the phased release of the Damson Parkway site, in a sustainable manner to provide high quality, low density housing.</p>
Q26	K Sunner [4351]		<p>The site was rejected in the 2012 SHLAA for reasons that were correct at the time and are still equally valid today.</p> <p>Infrastructure is inadequate.</p> <p>The rural roads serving the proposed site, Lugtrout Lane and Field Lane are narrow and rural in character which makes them unsuitable for the increase in traffic flow the development would result in. Also the existing junctions either end of Lugtrout Lane do not have the capacity to handle the additional traffic that would be generated. There is no footpath along most of Lugtrout Lane.</p>
Q26	Kier Living Ltd [5867]		<p>SHLAA housing trajectory demonstrates that Council is relying on a number of large-scale strategic allocations to deliver dwellings early in the Emerging Plan period. Site 16 comprises 5 separate site submissions/ownerships with no indication of consortium or agreement formed. Site subject to constraints including heritage assets, notable wildlife habitats and significant trees. Plan should require site-wide masterplan/development brief to be approved before applications made. Without agreement, unlikely that 400 dwellings will be delivered in first 5 years. High risk that significant proportion of 5 year housing requirement will not be delivered.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q26	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q26	Miss Frances Childs [5508]		<p>1.The impact of potentially an additional 1200 cars hitting the already inadequate surrounding road junctions at peak times.</p> <p>2..Building on a working farm and an old Orchard is an Environmental Sacrilege. The current wonderful wildlife will be destroyed forever</p> <p>3. What consideration has been given to potential upward of an additional 1200 patients registering with the two local GP clinics , which are already at full capacity ?</p> <p>4. I would strongly urge planners to look again at the impact a new road behind the existing properties in Pinfold road.will have on existing residents.</p>
Q26	Mr Alan Chandler [3863]		<p>Having lived in Pinfold Road for 50 years I always thought this site was green belt land???.However should development go ahead I wish to request that Pinfold Road remains as a cul-de-sac with no access by vehicles or pedestrians to any development on Site 16. Also that the orchard at the end of the road is kept as a green space in view of the wildlife and wild bird population present.</p> <p>Finally what road improvements are planned to accommodate traffic from the new homes on already heavily congested local roads ??.</p>
Q26	Mr Andrew Moseley [5839]		<p>Questions 16, 17, 18 and 26 within the plan. I fully support the arguments put forward of the joint working group from Hampton Parish Council and Catherine de Barnes Residents' Association response to the SMBC Draft Local Plan (\Parish Response to SMBC Draft Local Plan January 2019) submitted on 03.02.2019.</p> <p>I strongly oppose to the development of site 16 and do not believe it should be included as an allocated site due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - loss of Green Belt, - loss of an effective rural gap & defensible boundaries - the inability of local infrastructure to handle the development.
Q26	Mr Cliff Dobson [3740]		<p>Proposed Mitigation:</p> <p>If adopted, the southern boundary of site 16 should be placed at Hampton Lane, so existing property owners are not constrained from development by green belt designation at the same time as adjacent land is redesignated for housing. Development should be restricted at the periphery, to provide significant undeveloped buffer strips to retain open aspect and minimise impact on existing dwellings.</p> <p>Field Lane is not a suitable access road for proposed development, and widening would result in permanent loss of rural byway and ancient hedgerow. Access should be from Damson Parkway only.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q26	Mr Derek Wright [5705]		I have lived for the past 25 years in Pinfold Road directly adjacent to the proposed site for redevelopment. It has always been classed as Green Belt land with a very old orchard and meadow. The land has been untouched for a number of years and is full of wild life such as badgers, foxes, a number of deer, owls and many other species of birds and insects. It would therefore be a shame to destroy such a valuable site and for it to be lost forever
Q26	Mr Francis Ryan [3584]		Site 16 was originally rejected within the 2012 SHLAA for reasons which remain unchanged today. The infrastructure required to support a development of this size is totally inadequate and remains unchanged. Hampton Lane in particular, is already severely congested even during weekend periods and the impact that further traffic will have will completely change the character and relationship that Catherine De Barnes currently enjoys with Solihull Town Centre and surrounding areas. The character of the area as a whole and the Green Belt status currently in place will be completely destroyed and become yet another urban sprawl.
Q26	Mr Giles Cook [5299]		This greenbelt is mostly high performing agricultural land. It provides a buffer between urban Solihull and Catherine de Barnes. The current strongly defensible boundary of Damson Parkway would be breached. The proposed boundary to the east (Field Lane) is not a boundary to development between the canal and Lugtrout Lane. The proposed concept does not retain the notable wildlife habitat between Hampton Lane and the agricultural land or provide a wildlife corridor to the remaining Green belt. .
Q26	Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]		Concerns over flooding, accessibility especially access from Damson Parkway, a busy 40mph through road, and whether Hampton Lane is able to cope with additional traffic as there are significant limitations on what carriageway works could be undertaken to improve capacity.
Q26	Mr Mark Roberts [2967]		Hi, any new builds should be sympathetic to existing residents living in the area, looking at this plan making Pinfold Road a cut through would make the road even more of a problem with parking. Also building a road so close to the back of existing gardens, cutting into one of the last green belt areas in Solihull, would have noise / light pollution. Finally I don't think the impact of so many new houses on the existing road networks has been taken into account, the already congested neighbouring roads and traffic junctions struggle with existing volumes of traffic.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q26	Mr Neil Groutage [5281]		The two plans 96&97 have some significant differences which could cause confusion eg. a) The access from Damson Parkway moves by 50 feet on each plan. b) Our property has been obliterated by trees in the plan on page 97 which is really insensitive.
Q26	Mr Steven Webb [2960]		Encroachment in to Green Belt, I find the term 'lower performing' shocking, as it takes no account of value for biodiversity. Green space only of benefit to development when it could mitigate impact on existing properties. Layout likely to result in annoying car light pollution on the rear of some of the properties. Road network around Damson Parkway, especially near the traffic lights and down to Parkway Hospital is already badly congested and frankly dangerous at peak times. Lugtrout Lane unsuitable. Spoilt view for Pinfold Rd residents, risk/impacts of Pinfold Rd being a thoroughfare.
Q26	Mr Stuart Mason [5240]		Local roads cannot cope with existing traffic. The Meriden gap should be preserved
Q26	Mr Tony Moon [4964]		ITs important to rein and promote the sports pitches (eventhough these are not currently used.
Q26	Mrs Angela Ladds [5932]		I have lived in Pinfold Road for the last 48 years. My concern is about the pressure to build on Green Belt land which in this case includes an Ancient Orchard and a Meadow. The ecology of this area has been evolving undisturbed providing the perfect environment for Animals, Birds, Insects, with a rich Flora and Forna. Please consider this valuable asset. With careful management it's survivable will reward us all for years to come. Housing on this plot will put a great strain on Doctors, and Schools. The increase in traffic will have a drastic effect on our already busy roads.
Q26	Mrs Debbie Moseley [5838]		Questions 16, 17, 18 and 26 within the plan. I fully support the arguments put forward of the joint working group from Hampton Parish Council and Catherine de Barnes Residents' Association response to the SMBC Draft Local Plan (\Parish Response to SMBC Draft Local Plan January 2019) submitted on 03.02.2019. I strongly oppose to the development of site 16 and do not believe it should be included as an allocated site due to: - loss of Green Belt, - loss of an effective rural gap & defensible boundaries - the inability of local infrastructure to handle the development.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q26	Mrs Katrina Hickin [3227]		The land at the rear of Pinfold road is a habitat for wildlife including foxes, badgers, deer which will be destroyed by the proposed development. Damson Parkway is an extremely busy traffic route, it is very difficult to walk across the road from Pinfold to Yew Tree particularly with young children due to the volume and speed of the traffic - building more houses will increase the traffic in the area and make this situation worse, aswell as increasing the already lengthy queues of traffic on Damson Parkway. There is not enough capacity at Yew Tree doctors or local schools.
Q26	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Ok
Q26	Mrs Wendy Reeve [5884]		This area is historically green belt. Traffic on Lugtrout lane is already dangerously fast. Lugtrout lane is narrow with no footpath in parts and drainage ditches are on both sides of the road Field Lane has always been narrow and not built for the additional traffic such a large development will bring. Traffic in the surrounding areas is bad enough without putting more on local roads.
Q26	Ms Gill Dudas [5959]		Far to big a development on green belt land also where are the additional schools and Doctors to accommodate the extra residents. It will be overdeveloped in my opinion if it goes ahead it should be far smaller. We don't have a lot of green belt left locally a lot has been lost to the JLR development and also plans for road changes off solihull road and Catherine de Barnes lane to the A45 where more green belt is being lost.
Q26	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		Objection to development of Site 16 East of Solihull between Lugtrout Lane and Hampton Lane located within existing green belt. Protection of two Heritage Assets (Field Farm and 237 Lugtrout Lane) and their setting is essential. Developers should guarantee that Sports Facilities (Coldland Colts Boys FC) shall be relocated prior to residential development or retained. No consideration has been given to mains services to proposed housing, including electricity, gas, water supply, mains drainage and telecommunications. Negotiate Section 106 agreement with developer to improve Site of Special Scientific Interest along Grand Union Canal from Catherine de Barnes to Damson Parkway.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q26	Raj Loi [3132]		Object to loss of local green belt land. Local residents have moved to the area due to its beauty and want to keep it that way. No thought given to residents of Pinfold Road, with affordable housing, construction works, access road close to rear gardens, access from Road, increasing issues with sewer blockages. If it goes ahead, we will see reduced nature and increased disruption (footfall, traffic, crime, flood risk, facilities). We also have a vested interest as a storm flood pipe runs under our property and will be affected. Will SMBC purchase affected properties/provide compensation?
Q26	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site should be extended east to Catherine de Barnes to allow for more growth in the Solihull central area. The development of further and would have no significant impact on the wider Meriden Gap beyond Catherine de Barnes to the east. Most of the land is poorly performing Green Belt with sports pitches etc and additional residential development should be allowed on such land including the Red Star Sport Ground - Site 412 which is not adequate in size for a proper sports facility
Q26	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle. However, the site boundary needs clarification so that site refs 143 and 339 are confirmed as green sites. The SDLP 2019 supplementary document clearly confirms the new boundary and logically the additional land to be proposed for removal from the Green Belt should be from Damson Parkway up to the Grand Union Canal to the north to provide a firm defensible and logical Green Belt Boundary along with the inclusion of all of the land between Damson Parkway and the proposed eastern boundary of the site.
Q26	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		Sport England are supportive of the retention of the site and this should be reflected in the policy allocating the site. The opportunity to extend the site should also be explored. If it is decided that the site is to be re-provided Sport England and the Football Foundation would welcome a discussion to understand the location and the potential impact on the adjacent clubs; Hampton FC and Glades FC. If the playing field is to be re provided the policy allocating the site should meet the requirements of NPPF paragraph 97(b) and Sport England's Playing Fields Policy.
Q26	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q26	Strategic Land and Property Team SMBC [6226]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	<p>Release of this land would provide a sustainable location for the development of new homes to help the Borough achieve its housing requirement within the plan period.</p> <p>The site is immediately adjacent to the existing settlement and clear, defensible boundaries can be established.</p> <p>The release of the site is policy compliant and therefore justifiable to help SMBC meet their housing needs across the Borough.</p> <p>The DLP recognises the need for infrastructure requirements to be fulfilled to ensure site deliverability. The main constraint was noted as the Listed Buildings to the eastern edge of the site. These can be sensitively managed.</p>
Q26	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>No objection in principle. Site 16 has been modified following the SDLP 2016 consultation to include land north of Lugtrout Lane up to the Grand Union Canal. However, this revised site boundary north of Lugtrout Lane needs to be clarified within the Masterplans document and the site assessment document such that both Site Ref 143 and 339 are confirmed within the allocation site and shown as green within the document (site Ref 143 appears as amber).</p>
Q26	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		<p>Further ecological surveys are needed before to identify ecological constraints and should be done before the developable area is decided.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Solihull Town Centre & Mature Suburbs			
Q27	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 5 ha urban site is expected to deliver approximately 200 dwellings. However, the viability of the site for residential development has not been tested and the potential land contamination on the site is unknown. Recommendation in concept masterplan that consideration given to relocation or removal of the telecommunications mast if possible. Deliverability not demonstrated and should not be allocated.
Q27	Colin Davis [3352]		The site is a thriving industrial estate. It makes no sense to displace these business and make them move.
Q27	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Yes The facilities in this location are in need of improvement. It is in a strategically important location. As such development should be welcomed. There will be concern that replacement facilities are provided for and that the redevelopment is not indicative of jobs being cut at the Council. Whilst this is not the remit entirely of the plan, it can play a role in addressing any potential concerns in future iterations.
Q27	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Strategic Land and Property Team of SMBC (acting in the Council's capacity as land owner) [6043]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	Allocation of this land will provide a sustainable location for new residential development to help the Borough achieve its housing requirement within the plan period and is therefore supported. SMBC own the site. Site PO17 is located in an existing residential area north of Solihull Town Centre, with existing access on to Moat Lane and strong existing road infrastructure connecting the site along the A41 to M42 junction 5. The site is a brownfield site with close proximity to local facilities and services along and being situated in an established residential area is in a sustainable location for development.
Q27	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	As shown on the "Masterplan Document" published with the consultation, David Wilson Homes had some previous involvement with the Moat Lane site. They are no longer actively involved with this site due to the difficulties in delivering a commercially viable scheme. We do not consider this site to be a deliverable site and it should therefore be removed from the draft Plan.
Q27	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Potential conflict with employment Policy P3 on retention of employment land. Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option. This calls into question the delivery of the site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q27	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 5 ha urban site is expected to deliver approximately 200 dwellings. However, the viability of the site for residential development has not been tested and the potential land contamination on the site is unknown. Recommendation in concept masterplan that consideration given to relocation or removal of the telecommunications mast if possible. Deliverability not demonstrated and should not be allocated.
Q27	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	This Site is an existing industrial estate and the Council should ensure that any loss of employment provision is acceptable. This should be evidenced. Further to this, the Council should ensure that any retained employment provision is not adversely impacted by the creation of a noise-sensitive use close by. Further to this, given the Site has an industrial use currently, the Council should evidence that the Site is deliverable within the required timeframes and that there are not issues (such as contaminated land) which will prohibit the delivery of the Site or its viability.
Q27	Jim Burton [5772]		I do not see any mention regarding possible congestion due to increased traffic loading along Lode Lane. This is by a school and may present a danger to pupils.
Q27	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 5 ha urban site is expected to deliver approximately 200 dwellings. However, the viability of the site for residential development has not been tested and the potential land contamination on the site is unknown. Recommendation in concept masterplan that consideration given to relocation or removal of the telecommunications mast if possible. Deliverability not demonstrated and should not be allocated.
Q27	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 5 ha urban site is expected to deliver approximately 200 dwellings. However, the viability of the site for residential development has not been tested and the potential land contamination on the site is unknown. Recommendation in concept masterplan that consideration given to relocation or removal of the telecommunications mast if possible. Deliverability not demonstrated and should not be allocated.
Q27	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Potential conflict with employment Policy P3 on retention of employment land. Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option. This calls into question the deliverability of the site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q27	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 5 ha urban site is expected to deliver approximately 200 dwellings. However, the viability of the site for residential development has not been tested and the potential land contamination on the site is unknown. Recommendation in concept masterplan that consideration given to relocation or removal of the telecommunications mast if possible. Deliverability not demonstrated and should not be allocated.
Q27	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The 5 ha urban site is expected to deliver approximately 200 dwellings. However, the viability of the site for residential development has not been tested and the potential land contamination on the site is unknown. Recommendation in concept masterplan that consideration given to relocation or removal of the telecommunications mast if possible. Deliverability not demonstrated and should not be allocated.
Q27	Mr Tony Moon [4964]		Its a brown field site , an ideal option
Q27	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Given that there are likely to be significant site preparation costs, it seems inappropriate for the site to be allocated for development for 200 dwellings without a detailed viability assessment. Until this evidence work has been carried out, we contend that the site does not satisfy the national policy requirements
Q27	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Ok
Q27	Mrs Wendy Reeve [5884]		This area is well suited for housing and will fit in well with the wharf lane development
Q27	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		The relocation of the old Council Depot to a site more central in the M42 Gateway area would be sensible, but the remaining Boulton Road/Vulcan Road business uses are an employment asset which is irreplaceable. No provision is made in the Plan for relocating those uses and there must be a question mark therefore whether that site can be delivered.
Q27	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Potential conflict with employment Policy P3 on retention of employment land. Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option. This calls into question the deliverability of the site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q27	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Potential conflict with employment Policy P3 on retention of employment land. Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option. This calls into question the deliverability of the site.
Q27	Strategic Land and Property Team SMBC [6226]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	Allocation of this land will provide a sustainable location for new residential development to help the Borough achieve its housing requirement within the plan period. The site is outside the Green Belt and performs well in terms of accessibility and the use of previously developed land. Infrastructure requirements are noted to ensure deliverability. Potential land contamination and existing onsite lease agreements are identified as constraints to the site. Despite these, the site is a brownfield site in a sustainable location surrounded by established residential development.
Q27	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Potential conflict with employment Policy P3 on retention of employment land. Relocation of employment uses may be an option but to where within Solihull? No indication is given within the Plan of such an option. This calls into question the deliverability of the site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Solihull Town Centre & Mature Suburbs			
Q28	Alex Gee [4167]		<p>Object due to loss of sports facility in area where several facilities lost, and need is clear. Should respect covenant and remove from Draft Plan. Significant increase in traffic volumes and associated traffic pollution exacerbating existing congestion. Density out of character with the neighbouring areas, being 4/5 times that elsewhere. Parking likely to be cramped and cause an increase in street parking on Sharmans Cross Road. Already chaotic during peak times and Arden Club will lose 70-80 spaces. Important buffer zone for the ancient woodland of Pow Grove supporting wide variety of wildlife.</p> <p>Design and Appearance</p>
Q28	Alison Jordan [5935]		<p>The 2013 all party policy to maintain the Sports Ground only Covenant on the site of the Rugby pitches should be honoured. Nothing has materially changed since this date.</p> <p>Concern regarding impact on the future of the tennis club. Already insufficient similar facilities in vicinity. Reduced car parking for tennis club and impact on safety of users.</p> <p>Proposed development is too dense in comparison to surrounding properties</p> <p>Destroy character, distinctiveness and charm of area</p> <p>Proposal would destroy habitat of many insects and small creatures. Nesting buzzards have recently returned to the site.</p> <p>Place even greater pressure on the Victorian drainage system on Sharmans Cross Road</p> <p>Already inadequate school places in area and there is reduced funding for schools. Additional housing will add pressure to this.</p> <p>Already inadequate and stretched medical facilities in area.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross Road is already busy and dangerous</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Andrew Cherry [4230]		<p>Style/density of development will be very different from the local area which has family homes. To fit 167 homes, flats will have to be included. Existing residents will lose privacy and there will be increased noise.</p> <p>There are some very old trees on the site which support local wildlife. Developing the site will damage the biodiversity.</p> <p>In 2013 SMBC agreed to protect the use of the rugby ground for sport but high rental costs have meant that local teams cannot afford to use it.</p> <p>Sharmans cross road is prone to flooding.</p> <p>NPPF- the development is too far from Solihull Station and the town centre to satisfy the accessibility requirements.</p>
Q28	Andrew Harries [4160]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern about volume of traffic - Adding to existing congestion on Streetsbrook Road/Sharmans Cross Road junction and Woodlea Drive/Sharmans Cross Road
Q28	Andrew Robbins [4162]		<p>Use of sports grounds should not be used for anything else other than sporting purposes. Leaseholders proposed extortionate fees that discourage use for sport. Loss of sporting grounds/green space should not happen, they should be protected.</p> <p>Scale/density of houses out of character as 4/5 times that of area.</p> <p>Will exacerbate traffic and parking issues, drainage problems.</p> <p>Former rugby ground parking utilised by Arden Club yet at peak times parking currently inadequate. Reduction in parking will cause serious difficulties and compound traffic/parking issues. Development will cause disruption to Arden Club which could threaten its viability.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Andy Talliss [4415]		<p>Loss of Sporting Facilities, Rugby pitch has a stipulation which requires site to be used for sporting purpose. Concern at lack of investment in healthy lifestyles. Leasing the facilities - the lease holders either do not respond to enquiries, or price the site unrealistically, so that it makes it unviable for the use it was intended. If an extra 67/100 houses are built, local amenities will struggle. Additional traffic/parking and flooding issues.</p> <p>NPPF requires developments to have access to local amenities within 800m/10 minutes' walk. Site is 1700m from Solihull town centre and 1000m from station, so criteria not met.</p>
Q28	Angela Southall [3992]		<p>Development of 67- 100 new build houses would stand out as a 'eye sore' in this area in terms of density of housing and suitability.</p> <p>Increased traffic movements, further congestion, danger to pedestrians and cyclists using road, parking problems.</p> <p>Drainage network already inadequate, and increase in flood risk.</p> <p>SMBC documented in 2013 that this land would be</p> <p>Loss of sports facility. Land should be used for sports use only and freehold/covenant retained.</p> <p>This is a leafy neighbourhood with many mature trees protected by TPOs.</p> <p>Lack of capacity at nearby schools/health services.</p> <p><u>Not accessible or sustainable given distance to centre.</u></p>
Q28	Ann Nunn [4261]		<p>Rugby Ground should be retained for sport and not used for housing and the tennis club should be protected from encroachment.</p> <p>In 2013 the policy was affirmed by an SMBC all party committee that they would not sell the freehold of the Rugby Ground site or lift the covenants regarding sole use of the site for sport. These commitments must be upheld.</p> <p>67 more houses in this area would create many problems - not enough medical/school facilities to support more residents.</p> <p>Increase in population will make the existing congestion/pollution in Sharmans Cross Road much worse.</p> <p><u>Drainage system may not cope.</u></p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Ashi Bentley [5544]		<p>The Council should maintain the sports ground only covenant and restore the ground to sporting use.</p> <p>Development would increase traffic flow into Sharmans Cross Road, increase congestion at nearby junctions at peak time and exacerbate the existing danger to children due to parking outside Sharmans Cross School.</p> <p>Development would impact on the future viability of the tennis club and the proposed density is not in keeping with character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Inadequate medical and school capacity to support the increase in population.</p> <p>Questionable whether drainage system could cope given recent flooding on Sharman's Cross Road.</p>
Q28	B B Tran [4186]		<p>Objection to site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land has a sports ground only covenant - Loss of sports facility - Density is out of character with the area - Existing traffic and parking problems in the area - Negative impact on highway safety - Increase air pollution - Existing provision of medical and school facilities is inadequate - Not in an accessible location according to NPPF - Developments like these will ruin Solihull's reputation as a good place to live
Q28	Barbara Dennis [4088]		<p>Land should be retained for sports use, as there are a shortage of pitches in Solihull, and loss will reduce access to sport and activity for children with potential health implications.</p> <p>Arden Club should retain freehold assets, and would be adversely affected by new housing and potentially complaints about floodlighting/noise.</p> <p>There are tree preservation orders in place</p> <p>Housing density is too high and out of character with surroundings.</p> <p>Additional traffic associated with development will increase congestion.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Barbara Hall [4361]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Covenant for sporting uses on site should be upheld - Local sporting facilities needed to address health challenges of rising obesity and heart disease - Density out of character - Increased Traffic and Pollution - Parking - Flooding - Loss of TPO trees and habitat for wildlife - Schools and Medical Centres oversubscribed
Q28	Barbara Haste [3969]		<p>Land should only be used for sporting purposes and has a sports ground only covenant. Loss of sports facility Impact of additional development on traffic Inadequate infrastructure.</p>
Q28	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Concern over permanent loss of community playing field facilities in an area identified in Playing Pitch Assessment/Strategy, 2017, as being deficient in this area. Unused pitches need to be replaced if lost and no information provided to suggest an alternative site. Contrary to the strategic objective of protecting and promoting healthy sustainable communities.</p>
Q28	Benjamin Hill [3966]		<p>Site must be retained as a sports ground only. Any proposed development for houses on this site would be very detrimental to the character of Solihull. Sharman's Cross is already a busy road, especially during school entry/exit times with parking a problem issue. Important to retain the trees in the area and honour TPOs. The drainage problems of Sharman's Cross road are well known and therefore any further housing will put even more strain, lead to more flooding and likely cause accidents. The area's medical and school facilities could not cope with a further influx of new residents.</p>
Q28	Brian Savin [4024]		<p>High-density housing of this kind is completely out of keeping with the area and neighbouring properties. Concern for traffic issues & parking issues that may get worse Concern for amenities for the community - schooling, doctors surgeries etc. Loss of sport facilities - And what sports facilities will they use, if yet another one's been taken away? However, most important of all, the site earmarked for this development is subject to a Covenant stipulating that the land should only be as a sports ground. Oakmoor Ltd (the lessor) have undertaken to honour this covenant</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Briege Lawson [4143]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Object to Site 18 - Traffic already increased since junior school extension - Parents will no longer be able to park at Sharmans Cross pub, so more parking and congestion on side roads - Increased pressure on existing poor drainage system and flood r
Q28	Carolyn Ostler [4428]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection to Site 18. - Increase in traffic and congestion - More pollution. - Question capacity of local schools to take more pupils - Strain on existing facilities - schools, doctors, dentist etc. - Parking issues - Loss of local character - Loss of wild life habitat. - Loss of local sports facilities
Q28	Catherine Eaton [4003]		<p>Contrary to policy not to sell freehold of the site and covenants restricting the site to use only for sporting purposes.</p> <p>Development of this scale and density would change the nature of the area, destroying its character.</p> <p>Current road accesses unsuitable.</p> <p>Impact of additional traffic for the roundabout between Sharman's Cross Road and Danford/Prospect Lane already suffering from significant traffic problems.</p> <p>Pow Coppice, a valuable wildlife refuge would be adversely affected.</p> <p>Solihull Arden Club will be adversely affected as it already has a shortage of parking and this development will cause serious pressures on parking in the area.</p>
Q28	Catherine Williams [3650]		<p>The 2013 policy stated that this land should be used for sport only. I believe that this development will put immense strain on the local environment. Extra cars and parking will be added to already high levels of traffic. School and medical surgery over subscribed.</p>
Q28	Councillor J Tildesley [2119]		<p>I was disappointed in the extreme to see that previously refused applications for large sites have been re-introduced into this consultation. The land at Sharman's Cross Road is one of the two sites to which I specifically refer. The site should be returned to sporting or educational use.</p>
Q28	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>No</p> <p>There is considerable concern over this site. Not only does the site provide community Sports facilities, it also operates as an informal Public Open Space. There are already considerable congestion issues along Sharmans Cross Road at peak times. This development would undoubtedly exacerbate these problems.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	David Chamberlin [4502]		Existing sporting covenant should maintained. Proposed density would be significantly higher than surrounding area. Significant increase in traffic and concomitant parking problems in and around Sharmans Cross Road. Traffic congestion has become a significant problem in this part of Solihull and the above level of building can only make it worse. Any idea that the traffic problem could be alleviated by running a road out on to Winterbourne Road would be total folly, as well as be damaging/fatal to the future of a first class tennis club. Significant new pressure on medical and school capacity, which are already under strain.
Q28	Derek Goodban [4204]		Objection to Site 18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Previous planning refusals means site is not suitable - Existing covenant on the sports ground - Development out of character with the area - Loss of light, privacy and increased noise and pollution - Existing traffic congestion, parking and highway safety issues - Lack of sporting facilities - Loss of green space, trees and wildlife - Existing flooding issues - School & medical facilities oversubscribed
Q28	Dick Andrewartha [3404]		Traffic has steadily increased, with the opening of the orthodontist and expansion of the school. Cars are parked on the road all day and more parents are waiting on the road at rush hour. Cars mount the pavement when pavements are full of children. This piece of ground has been a valuable sports facility for the community for many years. In 2013 an SMBC all party committee meeting affirmed as policy that they would not sell the freehold of the site or lift the covenants regarding the sites only being used for sporting purposes and as ancillaries to sport.
Q28	Donald Haste [3588]		The land is covenanted for sporting purposes. Disruption during construction. Extra air and noise pollution. Loss of TPOs, woods and wildlife. Impact on Arden Club. Population in the area is quite dense and would likely increase by at least 300 to 400 persons. Plus numerous extra vehicles in an already busy area. There is a shortage of Medical Centres and there is insufficient Schooling facilities. Site should be deleted and land used for sports purposes as intended.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Donna Ponsonby [4345]		<p>Council has allowed current lessors to deliberately prevent the facility from being used by local clubs</p> <p>Density is out of keeping with the surrounding area</p> <p>Roads currently suffer with traffic and flooding- housing will make that much worse</p> <p>Destroy valuable green space</p> <p>Impact mature trees - some with TPOs</p> <p>Site should be removed</p>
Q28	Doug Rawkins [4089]		<p>High density development is out of character with the area.</p> <p>Inadequate educational/medical/drainage infrastructure for additional users.</p> <p>Sports use protected by covenant.</p> <p>Site not accessible to local amenities in town centre/station.</p> <p>Increased traffic will have a seriously detrimental effect on highway safety and the convenience of road users, and associated pollution.</p> <p>Danger to pedestrians, especially children, and cyclists.</p> <p>Sharmans Cross Road is a recognised emergency route, hence no speed bumps outside the primary/junior school. Any increase in traffic may adversely affect emergency vehicle movements.</p>
Q28	Dr Nigel Williams [4367]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need for accessible sporting facilities of paramount importance for the health and wellbeing for all of society but particularly for children and young people. - Sports grounds in ideal location to attract local groups - Solihull Council has previously acknowledged the importance of this by ensuring suitable drainage and reiterating the need for the covenants attached to the site to be honoured.
Q28	Dr Nigel Williams [4367]		<p>The need for accessible sporting facilities is of paramount importance for the health and wellbeing for all of society. The sports grounds on Sharman's Cross Road are in an ideal location to attract participating groups. Solihull Council has previously acknowledged the importance of this by ensuring suitable drainage and, in 2013, reiterating the need for the covenants attached to the site to be honoured. Loss of this facility will be detrimental to the youth of Solihull and signal a lack of importance attached to such community facilities.</p>
Q28	Dr P J M Sloan [4155]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site should be retained for sport use - Sport is important for tackling obesity, positive mental health - High density proposed is out of character with local area - Local infrastructure would be unable to cope

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Dr Phillipa Ann Roberts [3993]		Loss of playing fields contrary to covenant and to detriment of health. Density of development out of character with area and likely to result in loss of mature trees and wildlife habitats. Impact on residential amenity. Impact of the extra cars for 100 new houses exiting onto Sharmans Cross Road especially at peak hours. Risks concerning cyclists and pedestrians especially children. Inadequate infrastructure. SMBC should insist that Oakmoor make playing fields accessible at reasonable rent for local sports clubs instead of facilitating profiteering by a company that has been thorn in the side of the local community for 10 years.
Q28	Dr Tony Payne [3999]		Increase in Traffic Congestion, especially in peak hours backing from Streetsbrook Road/Station junction. Further Air Pollution from congested traffic affecting health/safety of Pedestrians and Cyclists, who are travelling sustainably. Danger from traffic movements to pedestrians/cyclists. Lack of Local Amenities, with local schools and surgeries oversubscribed, Argue strongly that it should remain as playing fields.
Q28	Edward Collis [5789]		The 2013 all party policy on the Rugby Club on maintaining the sports club only covenant and not selling the freehold be retained. Such a development would add significantly to the traffic in the area which is already severely congested in the rush hours. Add to the already severe parking problems in the area
Q28	Edward Fraser [4138]		- Support contingent on Site 18 including affordable housing, but not high end affordable.
Q28	Eileen Collis [5790]		The 2013 all party policy on the Rugby Club on maintaining the sports club only covenant and not selling the freehold be retained. Such a development would add significantly to the traffic in the area which is already severely congested in the rush hours. Add to the already severe parking problems in the area

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		An ordinary watercourse forms the western boundary of the site, however our 'Flood Map for Planning' only shows the flood risk from watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km ² , mapping of the risk from the watercourse has not been undertaken and as such this is the only reason the site is shown to lie in low risk Flood Zone 1. The assessment of flood risk and easement from the ordinary watercourse should be agreed with the LLFA, however we strongly recommend that hydraulic modelling of the watercourse is undertaken as part of a Level 2 SFRA to inform of the developable area and capacity of this potential allocation. Regardless of flood risk, we recommend an unobstructed green corridor is maintained along the banks of the watercourse for the purposes of protecting and maintaining green and blue infrastructure.
Q28	Eric D Vanes [4148]		<p>Objection to site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land has a sports ground only covenant - Loss of sports facility - Density too high and out of character with the area - Existing poor drainage - Felling of trees - Insufficient parking - Negative impact on air quality - Additional parking and congestion detrimental to children getting to and from school
Q28	Evan Winter [4205]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase volume of traffic - Lead to safety issues for pedestrians and cyclists - Level of air pollution will increase - Level of housing density is completely at odds with all the surrounding houses - Loss of sporting facilities - when a key government policy is to encourage people to be more active, loss of such facilities makes no sense.
Q28	Fiona Oakes [5768]		<p>Sports ground only covenant and not selling freehold should be upheld. Density would be 4-5 times at least surrounding area. Destruction of character and diminishing the distinctiveness of the area. Worsen already problematic parking in surrounding area. Tree preservation orders Drainage/flooding on Sharmans Cross with Victorian drains not coping. Inadequate medical and school capacity Damage to the future of the Tennis club and fitness to the public.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Frances Friel [4156]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land has a sports ground only covenant - Loss of much valued local community asset - Loss of sports facility - Density too high and out of character with the area - Existing flooding issues - Existing traffic and parking issues: Sharman's Road/Streetsbrook Road junction and Danford Lane island - Additional parking and congestion detrimental to children getting to and from school - Pressure on medical facilities and school places
Q28	Frances Friel [4156]		<p>SMBC leased this ground to Oakmoor who in turn have made no effort to continue the use of the land as a sporting facility. The traffic in the area is already bumper to bumper at key commuter and school collection times, along with flooding issues. The development will be out of character with local housing. I feel strongly that this proposal should not go ahead and that both the council and Oakmoor should follow the original covenant for this area.</p>
Q28	Frank Thompson [3887]		<p>I oppose this development on the grounds that the density of housing would be over 5 times that of the surrounding area. Not only would this place enormous demands on the local infrastructure, but it would change the character of the whole area, and not in a good way. Over the years I have seen many green spaces in this area disappear, replaced by housing developments. It is time to stop, and conserve what we have left. Policy to retain sports ground should be maintained.</p>
Q28	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>No objection in principle providing suitable relocation of sports facilities available. No commitment given to either deliverability or relocation. Playing pitches not in surplus in Solihull therefore development of the site uncertain</p>
Q28	Graham Law [3875]		<p>Affordable housing is what required by the country and younger generation and the location is in a remarkably doubtful position for such an enterprise. Sharmans Cross Road is already a dangerous traffic hazard and must not be increased. Provision of sporting facilities should be priority for young people.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Guy Turley [4464]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site has an existing covenant stating it is to be used for sporting purposes and ancillary facilities to sport and this should be upheld - Out of character with the surrounding area and overdevelopment - Sporting facilities important to tackle obesity and health-related issues - Highway safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists, especially at Junior School - Traffic congestion and parking issues - Loss of green space and wildlife habitat
Q28	H E & Mrs J L Biggs [4685]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Density of development out of character with the area - Loss of amenity - Loss of sporting facility - Potential for environmental and ecological damage - Add to further traffic congestion - Extra pressure on drains - Local schools and medical centres oversubscribed
Q28	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>We contend that it does not conform with national policy for site 18 to be allocated in the Solihull Local Plan Review until such time as replacement playing pitches can be provided to serve the local community to compensate for the loss. Therefore, under the terms of national policies, the site should be removed from the Solihull Local Plan Review and alternative site or sites found to accommodate the estimated 100 dwellings.</p>
Q28	Hazel Truman [4368]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of green space - Permanent loss of sports ground - Development would not be in keeping with the character of the area - Poor drainage and flooding - Traffic -Sharmans Cross Road is already an extremely busy road - Increased Pollution - Parking issues - Maintain the sports ground only covenant and not selling the freehold is upheld.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Ian & Janet Thomas [3755]		It's a sports field and we are short of sport's facilities in Solihull. with increasing obesity in young and old people in the area we should be encouraging sport not decreasing it. The proposed density of housing is not in keeping with the locality. Additional development would have an adverse effect on the local Schools and GP Surgeries. Traffic and parking is an issue in this area, increasing vehicle numbers would be detrimental to the environment in Solihull
Q28	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	It is noted that there are playing pitches within this Site which should be mitigated.
Q28	J A Woodall [4683]		Land has a sports ground only covenant and should be used for sporting purposes only. Site is unsuitable as access is too narrow for the traffic it would generate which would spill out onto Sharmans Cross Road which is already busy. Schools and surgeries are overloaded. Flooding and drainage is a problem. Density is far too great. The sports ground should be made usable as sport is essential for young people.
Q28	James Burbidge [6213]		The area will become busy and overpopulated Traffic on the road is already a problem Drainage would become even worse due to Victorian drainage system already being vulnerable all year around The Arden club would potentially be used as a walk through into Solihull, which the club are already battling against Will destroy the characteristics of the Victorian houses
Q28	James Rogers [4223]		1) The traffic in the local vicinity has reached saturation point. The implementation of traffic lights at the top end of Danford Lane next to Alderbrook School has resulted in Danford Lane and the associated areas becoming a car park in the morning and early evening. Further housing developments will only serve to worsen the volume and the associated pollution to the atmosphere. 2) Local amenities such as GP's, Dentists, School places etc will be even more stretched than now. 3) Retain the area for sporting facilities especially for younger people.
Q28	Jayna Thakrar [5829]		Land should be retained for sports use High density development is out of character with the area Trees need to be safeguarded Traffic and parking in Sharmans Cross Road already a problem particularly at peak times Inadequate school capacity as schools in area already oversubscribed

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Jennifer Kentish [4033]		<p>Loss of sporting facilities - the covenant that the land be retained for sporting use should remain.</p> <p>Destroy natural and unspoilt green habitats.</p> <p>Out of character and density with the neighbouring properties and area.</p> <p>Increased traffic- roads are already severely congested at peak times creating safety hazards and noise and air pollution</p> <p>Loss of parking for the tennis club and subsequent displacement.</p> <p>Will affect the unique character of existing properties and amenity of existing residents.</p> <p>Increase poor surface water drainage.</p> <p>Not within walking distance of the town centre or the station.</p> <p>Schools and medical facilities are already oversubscribed.</p>
Q28	Jenny Woodruff [3967]		<p>I'm surprised this was previously viewed as acceptable in principle. Losing this site reduces access to a sporting amenity (only unused due to the purchaser's unreasonable behaviour) and create a development that would not be in keeping with the local character with properties crammed causing issues with light, privacy and overshadowing. This would worsen the existing traffic congestion which is already a problem around school start/end times and increase pressure on local schools and health facilities which are already oversubscribed. Development would likely increase the risk of flooding in an already flood prone area.</p>
Q28	Jill Allen [5810]		<p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities.</p> <p>Sports use covenant should be upheld and council should not sell the freehold.</p> <p>Proposed density out of keeping and scale with surrounding development.</p> <p>Impact on mature trees and wildlife.</p> <p>Increased traffic and associated pollution and potential accidents</p> <p>Insufficient parking.</p> <p>Sharman's Cross Road is already subject to flooding during heavy rain.</p> <p>Development will exacerbate this.</p> <p>Insufficient schools and medical services already and further development in this area can only cause a degradation of services for existing residents.</p> <p>Site not sustainable in terms of distance to local amenities.</p>
Q28	Joanna Hill [3961]		<p>Wants to see the covenant retained on the rugby ground. Extra housing with increased density will result in heavier traffic. Additional housing will increase risk of flooding in area. Issues with school places and doctors. Density proposed will adversely affect character. Impact on TPOs.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Joanne Brindley [4150]		<p>Increased traffic on surrounding road network which is already congested and subsequent impact on highway safety and risk of accidents to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities and removal of the potential for the site to become a focus for community sport. Conflict with other Council and Local Plan priorities enhance physical and mental health and well being.</p> <p>Not in keeping with character or density of surrounding development.</p> <p>Medical and education facilities are already oversubscribed.</p>
Q28	Joanne Talliss [3941]		<p>Local amenities- concerned about the lack of local amenities to service an increased community/population</p> <p>Flooding- already experience issues with flooding on Sharmans Cross Rd and drainage systems not equipped to cope with additional load.</p> <p>Additional traffic and issues with parking, safety of children going to school, increased congestion and gridlock in the morning and evening.</p> <p>Sporting Facilities- loss of important facility to encourage healthy lifestyles which should be retained for sporting use. Concern that grounds for sport will disappear with these plans for building and others in the area, when Solihull already poorly provided for.</p>
Q28	John Bentley [4236]		<p>I demand that the council maintain the above covenant and take active steps to restore the ground as an active sporting facility for the benefit of the local community. that there is inadequate medical and school capacity to support the considerable increase in local population that the development of the sports ground would bring. I would also question whether services such as the old drainage system would cope with development of the sports ground.</p>
Q28	John Gee [4094]		<p>This sports field is protected by a covenant for its use for sporting purposes only</p> <p>Solihull is desperately short of sporting pitches, with several in this locality being lost to development over recent years</p> <p>The field is also important to support local wildlife</p> <p>Increase in congestion and pollution with extra 100 houses</p> <p>The housing density proposed is markedly different to surrounding areas, at roughly 5 times the density it is entirely inappropriate and will change the character of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>There will be a significant impact on 'on-street' parking in the area</p> <p>Sharmans Cross road often floods</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	John Handford [4032]		<p>1) ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC CONGESTION adding to the already congested roads of Streetsbrook and Sharmans Cross at peak times and particularly the dangers outside Sharmans Cross School.</p> <p>2) MEDICAL & DENTAL FACILITIES in the area are already overstretched to capacity without adding more housing plus the cars which will add to the traffic and parking and pressure on the facilities.</p> <p>3) GREEN SPACE. It is wrong to build on integrated sports/fitness facilities, pushing them further away even if they can be re-located, meaning they are more inaccessible and adding to traffic congestion and pollution.</p>
Q28	John R Smith [4133]		<p>- Objection to Site 18</p> <p>- Planning Committee must reiterate its 2013 all party policy on maintaining the sports ground covenant on this site</p> <p>- Housing density too high, out of character for the area</p> <p>- Concern for loss of sports ground and open space</p>
Q28	Jonathan Rudge [4225]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <p>- I demand that SMBC stands by its 2013 all party policy on the Rugby Ground on maintaining the sports ground only covenant and not selling the freehold be retained</p> <p>SMBC has the potential power to negotiate repurchase of the lease for a reasonable sum such that outside interests do not profit from a cynical windfall at the expense of our local community</p>
Q28	Joseph Debono [6146]		<p>The Council agreed that the freehold of the Rugby ground at site 245 will not be sold or the covenants restricting it for sporting uses will not be lifted. The new buildings are unlikely to be in character with the area and this will have a huge negative effect on the distinctiveness of the area a main reason why people would like to live in the town. Proposed development 4 to 5 times current density. Worsening effect on the already inadequate drainage facility. Even if no more houses are built, flooding in the area will become a common occurrence. Most of the area has TPOs and reducing the population of trees goes against the current need of increasing the number of trees for the benefit of the environment. There are already significant parking issues and development will cause more traffic jams and traffic pollution. School and medical facilities are already stretched in Solihull. Site 245 must be maintained as a sport facility. Sports facilities in the Borough are not adequate, development will reduce opportunities for healthy lifestyles.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Joyce Rothschild [5585]		<p>I understand the council's need to build more housing, but this is a scarce recreational amenity / resource and once it is gone, the impact for the community and the Borough will be greatly diminished.</p> <p>There is an all party policy on the Rugby Ground maintaining a sports ground only covenant. The freehold should be retained.</p> <p>Development of the site would affect wildlife and add significant strain on the area due to increased population, which would lead to worsening parking and increased congestion. This is already significant. Access to medical and education services are already stretched.</p>
Q28	Julia Williams [4244]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of valuable sporting facility. - Covenant in place to preserve this land for sporting and recreational use. - Impact on traffic congestion and parking. - Density of housing too great, thus impacting on traffic, parking and local facilities including school. - Not compatible with density of housing in local area.
Q28	Kalpesh Thakrar [4468]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High density housing would be out of character to the area - Land should be retained for sport use and covenant upheld - Huge shortage in NHS funding and removing sporting facilities will lead to further compound the obesity levels and strain on NHS - Added pressure on infrastructure - Existing traffic congestion and parking issues - TPOs should be retained - Poor drainage and flooding in area
Q28	Karen Clarke [4165]		<p>Extra traffic will exacerbate existing congestion and impact on highway and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>More pollution will be generated, affecting the welfare of residents and wildlife.</p> <p>Additional vehicle parking will be generated.</p> <p>Primary and secondary schools in the area are already oversubscribed.</p> <p>There is an abundance of wildlife in the area.</p> <p>Impact on character and appearance.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facilities - the area should be designated to sport as per the SMBC meeting (2013) with regard to the covenant that the site be used for sports only.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Karen Trueman [4652]		<p>Site should be retained for sporting use in perpetuity and the sports ground only covenant maintained. Utilisation of the site would help increase participation rates in sport.</p> <p>Part of this green open space is a SSSI which supports wildlife.</p> <p>Development would be out of scale not in keeping with local character.</p> <p>Development will exacerbate existing flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Increased traffic on already congested local roads.</p> <p>Impact on highway, pedestrian and cyclist safety.</p> <p>Further on-street parking will be generated, adding to existing chaos and nuisance.</p> <p>Health impacts from pollution from idling vehicles.</p>
Q28	Keith Dennis [4346]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 2013 SMBC affirmed that its policy was to maintain the sports only covenant and not to sell the freehold of the Rugby pitch. - Pitch has fallen into decay, suspect a deliberate strategy by the developers to bring it to a point where it is judged to be derelict - Loss of sports ground will negatively impact the health of the residents and children in the area. - Increased traffic will exacerbate existing issues - Density out of character with surrounding area
Q28	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Concern over permanent loss of community playing field facilities in an area identified in Playing Pitch Assessment/Strategy, 2017, as being deficient in this area. Unused pitches need to be replaced if lost and no information provided to suggest an alternative site.</p> <p>Contrary to the strategic objective of protecting and promoting healthy sustainable communities.</p>
Q28	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Concern over permanent loss of community playing field facilities in an area identified in Playing Pitch Assessment/Strategy, 2017, as being deficient in this area. Unused pitches need to be replaced if lost and no information provided to suggest an alternative site.</p> <p>Contrary to the strategic objective of protecting and promoting healthy sustainable communities.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Laura Gosling [6215]		<p>Covenants on this land maintain the land should be used for sporting purposes. Taking away opportunities to participate in sport will be detrimental to health and wellbeing. Should be developing site as a community to access nature and also as a play area.</p> <p>Development will negatively impact on the adjacent LWS in particular the network of corridors that are so important for creating pathways for birds and mammals to move between habitats. Increase in pollution will harm many different species</p> <p>The dense proximity of houses will disrupt species, for example noise can harm bird and animal behaviour, garden insecticides affect vegetation.</p> <p>Will impact the junction between Sharmans Cross Road and Streetsbrook Road, which is already congested. Should be working towards reducing air pollution rather than adding to it.</p> <p>Increased burden on amenities, existing doctors and schools are already massively oversubscribed</p>
Q28	Laura Westman [6166]		<p>I am a resident of Solihull, and I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed development of the Old Rugby Club, Sharmans Cross Road, Site 18 the in the draft local plan supplement - Plan site 245. This proposal will have a detrimental impact on local sporting facilities and is not in keeping with the surrounding roads to Sharmans Cross. This will result in the destruction of character and will diminish the distinctiveness of the area.</p>
Q28	Laurence & Rachel Bannister [6298]		<p>Overdevelopment of site and out of scale and character with surrounding development.</p> <p>Increased traffic and pollution. Impact on highway safety for drivers, pedestrians (including school children) and cyclists.</p> <p>Development will generate increased on-street parking and loss of spaces for Arden Tennis club.</p> <p>Exacerbate existing flooding on Sharmans Cross Road.</p> <p>Permanent loss of sporting facilities at a time when there is an existing shortage.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Development will overburden schools and medical facilities which are already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Inappropriate use of land as there is a covenant restricting the land for sporting use.</p> <p>Site does not meet sustainability criteria.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Lida Debono [6139]		<p>The Council agreed that the freehold of the Rugby ground at site 245 will not be sold or the covenants restricting it for sporting uses will not be lifted. The new buildings are unlikely to be in character with the area and this will have a huge negative effect on the distinctiveness of the area a main reason why people would like to live in the town. Proposed development 4 to 5 times current density. Worsening effect on the already inadequate drainage facility. Even if no more houses are built, flooding in the area will become a common occurrence. Most of the area has TPOs and reducing the population of trees goes against the current need of increasing the number of trees for the benefit of the environment. There are already significant parking issues and development will cause more traffic jams and traffic pollution. School and medical facilities are already stretched in Solihull. Site 245 must be maintained as a sport facility. Sports facilities in the Borough are not adequate, development will reduce opportunities for healthy lifestyles</p>
Q28	Louise Gee [4200]		<p>the impact of any development here will adversely affect the character and amenities of the area. The sports field is protected by a covenant for its use for sporting purposes only The sports field is important for wildlife. Would cause a significant increase in traffic volumes and associated traffic pollution, exacerbating and already unacceptable situation. Parking on the development will be cramped Density will be significantly out of character with the neighbouring areas. Plan is misleading -previous planning application refusal Affordable Housing - This is not the case, there were many other reasons for the site being considered unsuitable</p>
Q28	Malcolm Trueman [4538]		<p>Overdevelopment of the site. Density out of keeping with character of the surrounding area. Detrimental impact on wildlife and site includes mature TPO trees. Development will exacerbate existing congestion, parking and pollution issues. Development will exacerbate existing flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road. Loss of a sporting facility for young people who are able to access the site independently. The existing covenant restricting use of the site for sports use only, must be maintained.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Margaret Burling [3984]		<p>No other sports pitches within reasonable distance.</p> <p>There is a demand for suitable pitches at an affordable rent- not at the high level that the developers currently charge to dissuade people from using the pitch</p> <p>Development is far denser than the surrounding area and would be inappropriate</p> <p>More pressure of services with an increase in population</p> <p>TPOs on trees that would be lost</p> <p>NPPF - "Local planning authorities should...take account of the needs of the local population(such as for sport)".</p>
Q28	Margaret Young [3960]		<p>Site should be made available to encourage participation in sport in Solihull which is poorly provided for and where other facilities are threatened. Permanent removal of the neighbouring facilities will threaten survival of tennis club. Proposed development is not in keeping with the surrounding area and will change its appearance/nature. Traffic congestion is already a major problem in this area. Insufficient parking spaces will increase on-street parking. Reduced highway safety for cyclists/pedestrians. Increased pollution will result from the additional traffic. Schools/doctors are heavily oversubscribed in the area. Loss of green space will cause environmental damage. Will exacerbate risk of flooding. Does not meet accessibility criteria.</p>
Q28	Maria Cooper [6295]		<p>The land should be retained for sports use at a time when such facilities are lacking.</p> <p>There would be a strain on available school places and doctors surgeries which are already over subscribed.</p> <p>Traffic would be heavier around all local roads which at peak times are already under stress with long tail backs.</p> <p>The density of the build would be totally out of character for the area.</p> <p>Development will increase pressure on parking in the local area as on-site parking will be inadequate.</p>
Q28	Marion Smith [3696]		<p>A housing development would result in many mature trees being lost. Increased traffic and safety issues, especially for cyclists and children accessing school. Local schools and health centres are already oversubscribed. Sharmans Cross Road has problems with drainage and flooding when there is heavy rain and any housing development will only compound this problem. Concern over loss of sporting facilities on site protected for this use. Site does not meet sustainability criteria as station and town centre greater than 800m away.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mark Collis [5788]		The 2013 all party policy on the Rugby Club on maintaining the sports club only covenant and not selling the freehold be retained. Such a development would add significantly to the traffic in the area which is already severely congested in the rush hours. <u>Add to the already severe parking problems in the area</u>
Q28	Martin Gollogly [4192]		The traffic is already an absolute nightmare and is clearly getting worse. Traffic from Blossomfield Road typically goes up to around 56/58 Sharmans Cross Road in one direction and from the Junior School all the way to the Sharmans Cross roundabout in the other. The traffic around Blossomfield School is so bad that drivers now regularly drive on the pavement to get past. Additional development will generate even more traffic, making crossing the road difficult and unsafe. Parking is already inadequate. The local school near Sharmans Cross would need to have yet another intake added.
Q28	Mary Jones [3702]		Density of new development would lead to the destruction of character and distinctiveness of the area. The shortage of parking on the proposed development would only worsen if Solihull Arden Club were to lose car parking spaces. More chaos on Sharmans Cross Road, particularly hazardous at peak school times. Impact on wildlife and Pow Wood subject to recent management. Land earmarked for sporting facilities should be protected and used for such purposes.
Q28	Mary R Butler [4254]		Objection to Site 18: - Site should be retained for sporting purposes - Council's findings in 2013 were that the sports ground would remain for sporting purposes; Council affirmed this policy and they would not sell the freehold of this site or lift the covenants - Since 2013 no effort as far as I can tell have been made by the owners of the land to attract or use this ground for any sporting purpose - Delete site from Draft Local Plan Review, believe this will be the only way that sporting activities will return to this ground.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mauro Vinti [6119]		Believes the land should be retained as sports land as per the covenants which exist on the land and which have been agreed by SMBC. Proposed density is four to five times the surrounding area and will worsen parking problems. Roads are already subject to parking restrictions. Streetsbrook Road and Sharmans Cross Road is already a v busy junction especially at rush hours with traffic queuing back on Sharmans Cross Road sometimes to beyond Sharmans Cross Junior School. Further development will exacerbate traffic problems. Areas has old style Victorian sewers which would not cope with additional surface water run off. The gardens on Winterbourne Road already suffer with difficulty in drainage. Concern how TPOs on the site would be protected. Is concerned over the lack of primary and secondary school places and inadequate hospital services to accommodate further residents.
Q28	Merrill Flood [3878]		Development will have serious effect on pedestrian/vehicular safety of area, especially children walking/cycling to school. Increased traffic will cause increased pollution. There have been many, many instances of flooding in Sharmans Cross Road. The high density of proposed development is totally out of character with the surrounding area. The many mature trees (with Preservation Orders on them) which enclose the site will almost certainly be damaged, and habitats in Pow's Grove destroyed. Council's policy that the freehold of the site in question would not be sold and neither would they lift the covenant regarding the site.
Q28	Michael Hannon [4429]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agreed (all party) policy on the Rugby Ground, established in 2013 - which confirms and reaffirms that the the sports ground only covenant must be maintained and the freehold must not sold - MUST be retained. - Sports pitches must not be lost - Density of development is unsuitable. - Strain on school/ GP infrastructure. - Increased road traffic and congestion, pollution and safety near a school - Significant impact on wildlife and environment. - Detrimental impact of loss of green spaces on mental and physical wellbeing of community in Solihull
Q28	Michael J Foster [3654]		Land should be retained for sports use. Significant increase in traffic since 2013, limited access to site will add to problems. Risks to pedestrians and especially children near school. Delay for emergency vehicles. Will exacerbate existing flooding problems.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Michael Joiner [6207]		<p>Site has been used for social and sporting for years, area has been subject to speculation since demise of rugby club, this would result in the loss of this sporting facility.</p> <p>Such a valuable natural facility is rare and should be cherished, once lost it will never come back. Wildlife, trees and open spaces to enjoy fresh air will be lost</p> <p>Road networks are already stretched and there is concern over the lack of facilities such as doctors and space at local schools. There are other more suitable areas for housing. Additional traffic will not only be residents but service vehicles, deliveries.</p> <p>Danger of losing the title 'Urbs in Rure' due to this type of development</p>
Q28	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>No objection in principle providing suitable relocation of sports facilities available. No commitment given to either deliverability or relocation. Playing pitches not in surplus in Solihull therefore development of the site uncertain.</p>
Q28	Miss Nisha Jassal [6174]		<p>The development is not in keeping with the character of the area and will materially adversely impact on the appearance, quality, use and amenity of the area and will devalue the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Impact on traffic and parking.</p> <p>Impact on school places and medical services.</p> <p>Many trees in and around the site are protected by TPOs which should not be felled.</p> <p>Other sites should be considered with more space for the associated infrastructure demands and look to release land in greenbelt for proper, considered development.</p> <p>The site should be retained for sporting use as per the covenant on the site.</p>
Q28	Miss Shivangee Maurya [5241]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lots of congestion in this area at peak times, more housing will make the problem worse - The new builds will also not fit in with the current the look of the area - Loss of pitches, there will be none in the locality

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Moira Keeble [5804]		Land should remain available for local community use. Existing covenant for sporting use should remain in place. Given childhood obesity issues, the land should be used for recreational purposes. The wildlife would be disturbed, including foxes, badgers, birds of prey. Already existing traffic congestion on Sharmans Cross Road and potential for future accidents. Existing flooding and drainage issues exacerbated. Local schools and surgeries are at maximum capacity.
Q28	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concern over permanent loss of community playing field facilities in an area identified in Playing Pitch Assessment/Strategy, 2017, as being deficient in this area. Unused pitches need to be replaced if lost and no information provided to suggest an alternative site. Contrary to the strategic objective of protecting and promoting healthy sustainable communities.
Q28	Mr & Mrs David Hull [3876]		Objection to site 18 Loss of sports facility when there are insufficient facilities in Borough. Density of development is already at peak and no capacity for additional development. Increase in traffic will be dangerous and exacerbate issues with parking and air pollution
Q28	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concern over permanent loss of community playing field facilities in an area identified in Playing Pitch Assessment/Strategy, 2017, as being deficient in this area. Unused pitches need to be replaced if lost and no information provided to suggest an alternative site. Contrary to the strategic objective of protecting and promoting healthy sustainable communities.
Q28	Mr & Mrs F L & Mrs M E Miller [5713]		Site has a covenant for sports use. Development of the site would remove another site from public sports facilities in Solihull when the borough has so few. Goes against all planning logic that the site be used for yet another intrusion into garden and green areas. Proposed high density is much higher than surrounding development. Additional traffic would cause problems on already busy and comparatively narrow roads and cause devaluation of neighbouring property. Main problems relate to drainage. Sewers unable to cope and major drainage works will be needed.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mr & Mrs Howard & Susan Jones [6231]		<p>The site has a covenant which restricts use to sporting use only. This should be maintained.</p> <p>The density would be 5 times that of the surrounding area, diminishing its character and distinctiveness.</p> <p>Parking in the surrounding area would become a nightmare.</p> <p>There are a number of tree preservation orders in operation.</p> <p>The Victorian drainage system is already fully stretched, and would, almost certainly, break down completely if forced to cope with an increase in capacity.</p> <p>The existing medical/educational facilities would be sore pressed to cope with the influx that would result from proposed residential development.</p>
Q28	Mr & Mrs Jewitt [4394]		<p>Local medical and education services already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Impact of additional traffic on highway and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Development will exacerbate existing flooding issues on Sharmans Cross Road and add to existing congestion and parking problems.</p> <p>Impact of construction traffic on Sharmans Cross Road which is already dangerous.</p> <p>The site has a covenant which requires it to be used for sporting use and it is therefore inappropriate for inclusion in the Local Plan.</p> <p>Concerned that this and other sports grounds will disappear</p>
Q28	Mr Christopher Allen [3031]		<p>Issued regarding - Permanent loss of sporting facilities, change in policy to protect use for sport, higher density than surroundings, design and appearance including mature trees and environmental benefits, increased traffic, gridlock at peak times, hazards to schoolchildren, increased parking and associated pollution, worsening flooding, capacity of schools and medical centres, and sustainability of site nearly double distance from local amenities as required in NPPF.</p>
Q28	Mr Christopher Hall [3220]		<p>Number of playing fields in Solihull is worryingly inadequate and as Solihull grows, their importance for exercise to address physical and mental health issues cannot be over-stated. The Council's 2013 decision, affirming that ground will only be used for sporting purposes, should not be overturned. Density is out of scale/character with surroundings. Development will have a serious effect on highway safety, wildlife habitats and amenity. Sharmans Cross Road is already subject to flooding during heavy rain. In addition to cramped parking for the new development, Arden Club could lose approximately 75 parking spaces. Site is beyond walking distance to amenities.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mr John Southall [2995]		Development of 67-100 new houses would stand out as a 'eye sore' in this area in terms of density of housing and suitability. Will lead to increased traffic movements, exacerbating congestion, highway safety issues, noise levels and impacts on amenity. Parking likely to be insufficient. Drainage system unable to cope leading to flooding. SMBC documented in 2013 that this land would be used for sports use only and that the freehold would not be sold. This is a leafy neighborhood with many mature trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders. Site not accessible to town centre amenities.
Q28	Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]		Concerns over site accessibility, car park capacity, increased traffic density, pedestrian safety particularly with a school very close to the site, and whether the <u>site is suitable for high density housing.</u>
Q28	Mr Mark Phillips [4103]		Objection to Site 18: - I believe the land has covenants restricting the site for sports use ONLY. - Solihull Arden Rackets club abuts this site, and parking for this facility is already at a premium in busy times. It is quite easy to see that this (another sporting facility) could be precariously placed should this large scale infill development proceed. - Concerns regarding the impact of development on the woodland SINC at Pow Grove.
Q28	Mr Michael Gosling [5958]		Raise objections that the site would be no longer be used for, or be available for, sporting or associated purposes. Concerns development will be out of character with the local area and will add pressure on existing school and doctors services.
Q28	Mr Mick Westman [4056]		Incorrect to state that PA refused solely on affordable housing grounds, as partly on loss of sports facilities. Compensation only necessary due to Oakmoor setting rental levels too high and allowing buildings to deteriorate. Long period of decline in sports facilities in Borough, contrary to awareness of health/well-being benefits of sport/green spaces, which DLP continues. Contrary to policy/covenant to retain sports use. Environmental impacts; density out of character, increased traffic/pollution, impact on congestion, dangers to pedestrians/cyclists/children. SMBC should retain site as sports ground & establish a working group of residents/interested sports clubs to develop a sports facility.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mr Nicholas Carter [5720]		<p>Loss of sporting/leisure facility at a time when there needs to be more for young people to do. Site wholly unsuitable for a large number of new dwellings.</p> <p>Insufficient local facilities for schools and medical provision.</p> <p>Will cause parking and traffic chaos.</p> <p>Junction between Sharmans Cross Rd and Streetsbrook Rd is one of the worst in the borough for congestion and danger, particularly as Stonor Park Rd and Dorchester Rd also join Streetsbrook Rd at this point. Significant congestion at rush hour which results in risk taking.</p> <p>This would become worse with additional drivers trying to exit a new estate.</p>
Q28	Mr Patrick Montague [3329]		<p>Site should be preserved as a sports ground. The existing covenant still stands and residential redevelopment is contrary to this.</p> <p>There has been avoidance in allowing the pitches to be used; more sports facilities across the borough are being lost when health and well being are becoming more prevalent issues.</p> <p>Unlikely to get a replacement so close to communities served with required facilities, for the cost.</p> <p>The site is not sustainable.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Density out of keeping with surrounding area.</p> <p>Car parking problems will be exacerbated.</p> <p><u>School and medical services already oversubscribed.</u></p>
Q28	Mr Phil Downer [6296]		<p>Current car parking difficulties on surrounding roads in the local area will be exacerbated.</p> <p>The local school will have to accommodate more pupils.</p> <p>Development would be contrary sites sporting use only covenant which must be retained for current & future generations.</p> <p>Expansion at Birmingham Airport will attract more visitors adding to congestion.</p> <p>Urbs in Rure is on its way out.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mr Philip Harrison [5781]		<p>Sports ground only covenant and not selling freehold should be upheld. Solihull needs more investment in recreational and sporting facilities, not less.</p> <p>Density would be 4-5 times greater than surrounding area.</p> <p>The character and distinctiveness of the locality in this mature suburb would be damaged beyond recognition and forever .</p> <p>There is already inadequate parking in the locality and the surrounding roads would be overloaded by the additional traffic.</p> <p>Loss of trees and other green infrastructure.</p> <p>The local infrastructure would not cope with the increased number of residents (schools, GP surgeries, Solihull hospital, drainage, police, fire etc).</p>
Q28	Mr Stan Lewis [5573]		<p>In the Draft Local Plan Timetable document, (http://www.cgra.org.uk/documents/draft_local_plan_timetable.pdf), the statement is made that 'Sports Ground is currently unused'; this statement is misleading as there are many amateur and local sports clubs and persons who would wish to utilise the land for sporting purposes but are prevented from doing so even though the land is designated for sports use only.</p>
Q28	Mr Stan Lewis [5573]		<p>The land should be used for sport, as agreed.</p> <p>School and medical services will be further stretched, having a detrimental effect on provision for existing residents.</p> <p>Additional traffic and associated pollution on an already busy route will increase danger to pedestrians, cyclists and school children.</p> <p>Loss of a 'green lung' for Solihull, containing wildlife and mature trees.</p> <p>Flooding issues on and around the site.</p> <p>Loss of sporting facility that cannot be replaced with a similar local facility.</p> <p>Misleading to suggest that the sports ground is unused. Many local clubs would wish to use the facility.</p>
Q28	Mr Steven Webb [2960]		<p>My objection is purely on the density of the properties. I live in Solihull but not near this site but looking at the plan the housing density seems too much for the area. It reminds me of the density plan for Dickens Heath and look what a nightmare that has turned in to, a once nice quiet area is looking more and more like a badly designed building jungle.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mr Sunil Jassal [6027]		Development would: result in the loss of sporting facilities of historical importance utilised by local people. destroy natural and unspoilt green habitats. be out of character with the neighbouring properties and area. increase traffic- roads are already severely congested at peak times creating safety hazards and noise and air pollution affect the unique character of existing properties, affecting the amenity of existing residents increase poor surface water drainage Removal of mature trees would affect climate change, and increase risk of flooding. <u>Not within walking distance of amenities in the town or the station.</u>
Q28	Mr Tony Moon [4964]		The area needs to have good sports facilities, these need to be retained and improved, managed by local people
Q28	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concern over permanent loss of community playing field facilities in an area identified in Playing Pitch Assessment/Strategy, 2017, as being deficient in this area. Unused pitches need to be replaced if lost and no information provided to suggest an alternative site. Contrary to the strategic objective of protecting and promoting healthy sustainable communities.
Q28	Mrs Katie Wilson [5233]		- Support development as land being left idle and overgrown - Opportunity to provide more needed housing - New housing should be in keeping with the area and not over developed too densely.
Q28	Mrs A L Tran [4231]		Objection to site 18: - Land has a sports ground only covenant - Loss of sports facility - Density is out of character with the area - Existing traffic and parking problems in the area - Negative impact on highway safety - Increase air pollution - Existing provision of medical and school facilities is inadequate - Not in an accessible location according to NPPF - Developments like these will ruin Solihull's reputation as a good place to live

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mrs Beryl Hukin [4014]		<p>Loss of sporting facilities when land is covenanted and should be for sports use, there is a shortage of sports grounds and a there is a statutory requirement to replace any lost.</p> <p>Density is too high and out of character to area.</p> <p>Exacerbate already significant traffic problems on Sharmans Cross Road and into Solihull. Insufficient parking.</p> <p>Drainage inadequate and development will increase risk of flooding.</p> <p>Destruction of open space, TPOs.</p> <p>Infrastructure inadequate.</p> <p>Should be retained for sports use in line with covenant</p>
Q28	Mrs Betty Dillenberg [5770]		I wish to register my objection to the proposed construction of proposed nearby housing development of 67/100 houses on the Old Rugby Ground
Q28	Mrs D B Rainbow [6283]		Would destroy the character of the area, and the school, health and road infrastructure is inadequate.
Q28	Mrs Deborah Chard [3418]		<p>Major concerns on traffic congestion, pollution, road safety, water drainage/flooding, safety of pedestrians/cyclists using the pavements. This area is already severely congested for hours each morning and evening. A large scale development is not feasible for these reasons alone.</p> <p>Further, sporting facilities are vital to this area, and the covenant on this ground should be honoured.</p> <p>Also, a development of 60-100 dwellings is totally out of character with the area and is 4x denser than current housing. The appearance of the area and its environmental benefits will be permanently and adversely affected.</p> <p>Conflicts with NPPF promoting healthy communities policies.</p>
Q28	Mrs Elizabeth Foster [3943]		<p>Permanent loss of sports facility</p> <p>Use of land - SMBC should stand by policy that this land should be used for sport only, retain existing sports facilities especially as shortage in Borough.</p> <p>Sustainability- site does not meet accessibility criteria laid down in NPPF which requires developments to have access to local amenities</p> <p>Increased traffic and associated pollution, hazard for children.</p> <p>This is a designated cycling route and increased traffic would create a danger to cyclists</p> <p>Parking issues- especially at school pick up times</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>Schools and Medical Centres would be stretched</p> <p>Density is out of keeping with the area</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mrs Fiona Somerville [5786]		Sports Site should be retained. Affirmation by SMBC Committee in 2013 that freehold would NOT be sold nor existing covenants lifted. More investment in sporting facilities required in Solihull not less. Proposed housing density 4-5x greater than existing - damaging character and distinctiveness of area and failure to enhance it. Local infrastructure already overloaded so would not cope with more development. Loss of established trees and Green wildlife area.
Q28	Mrs Fiona Somerville [5786]		This is contrary to the 2013 Solihull MBC all party committee meeting affirmation as Council's policy that they would not sell the freehold of the site, nor lift the covenants regarding the sites only being used for sporting purposes and as ancillary to sport/recreation. * The character and distinctiveness of the locality will be lost forever. * Loss of established trees and green wildlife area. * Housing density would be increased 4-5 times that of the surrounding area.
Q28	Mrs Julie Westman [4074]		Proposal will have significant impact on the local community and destroy the character of the neighbourhood. This area of Solihull is highly valued for its environmental benefits and contains many mature trees with Tree Preservation Orders. Development of houses will destroy this space which is enjoyed by countless residents. Site too far from local amenities to be accessible so is not sustainable. I am also concerned about the additional demand the development will have on already over stretched highway network and facilities. Parking is often dangerous to pedestrians/school children and cyclists. Any increase will create a serious risk and hazard.
Q28	Mrs K Phillips [3938]		I would very much like the Council to enforce the covenants and actively seek and enable sports use. Particularly concerned that Pow Grove to be protected from impact of development, and that right of way through the wood is managed.
Q28	Mrs Kitty Cosgrove [6277]		Existing parking issues would be exacerbated. Medical and school capacity are at their limits.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mrs Michelle Pajic [6289]		Object that another well used green space is being considered for housing. There is a 2013 all party policy on the rugby ground on maintaining the sports ground only covenant and not selling the freehold. Extra pressure will be placed on medical and academic choice for existing population if houses built. People pay the higher house and rental premiums to live and enjoy the character and distinctiveness of the area, this would be destroyed. Would result in the loss of sporting facilities. Would cause problematic parking. destruction of trees and possible drainage and flooding problems on Sharmans Cross Road
Q28	Mrs P Goodban [4405]		Objection to Site 18: - Proposed development will be overbearing, out of scale and out of character with the area - Area is not wasteland for development but valuable open space - Detrimental to the local wildlife and ecosystem - Historical covenant to ensure this area of land is used only for sport and this should remain as agreed. - Will inevitably bring an increase in traffic turning on to a road which is already heavily used especially at peak times- as well as with the traffic from the oversubscribed school
Q28	Mrs Patricia Harris [4679]		Objection to Site 18: - Development will be out of character in the area - Increased traffic and pollution - Highways infrastructure inadequate and parking issues - Area subject to flooding - Prospect Lane already been lost to development - Schools and medical facilities cannot cope Land should be retained for sports use. 2013 policy should be upheld.
Q28	Mrs S A tongue [5762]		The sports ground covenant should be maintained. The site contributes to the rural in rural character of Solihull. The tennis club is well used. Area has Victorian drains and will be unable to cope with additional development. Already difficult to access doctors dentists and schools. Impact of additional traffic and parking on already congested roads. Brownfield sites should be used first and houses do not look like they will be for first time buyers/renters which is what is needed.
Q28	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Area infrastructure will not cope mainly traffic

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Mrs Zoe Edwards [2907]		<p>Unsuitable site as density out of keeping with character of area. Will exacerbate traffic which is already heavily congested and creates fumes deterring walking. Problem particularly acute around Sharmans Cross school. No provision for cycle paths to town centre. Existing flooding issues in Sharmans Cross Road will be worsened. Existing schools and medical facilities oversubscribed. Inadvisable to remove valuable green spaces from near the centre of Solihull. Council should stand by agreement to retain site for sports purposes.</p>
Q28	Ms Sue Holden [5685]		<p>Traffic is already excessively high, there is frequent gridlock at the new roundabout and at the top of Sharmans Cross Lane. This is causing a large health and safety issue. There are not enough amenities to cater for increased population, in particular doctors appointments are not available. There are no other natural areas for residents to use. The 2013 all party policy on this Rugby Ground and maintaining the 'sports ground only covenant' and not selling the freehold should be retained because it is the will of this community and its people. The Council should be promoting the use of green spaces dedicated to community activities</p> <p>Site 18 is a different type of park that has natural beauty where people can really feel the motto 'Urbs in Rure' makes some sense. Currently they support a variety of wildlife, as do the surrounding hedgerows and are a place for respite. Sharmans Cross Junior school is over subscribed and would need expansion into existing greenery reducing opportunities for children. Local convenience stores do not have capacity to serve extra people and parking is already an issue. Pavements and roads are overcrowded at school times. Crime rate has increased.</p>
Q28	Neil Eaton [4181]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site should be retained for sports use - Existing covenant on site placed by SMBC all-party committee - what is the policy on lifting that? - Density of housing inappropriate and out of character with the area - Comments in Para. 271 are inaccurate - Existing traffic and parking problems would be worsened - Row. Conifer should be protected for wildlife

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Neil Glacken [6212]		Development will alter the character of the area (due to density and number of houses proposed). Will bring additional strain on an already congested traffic system including additional pollution. Loss of much needed sports facilities and playing fields - there already is a shortage in Solihull which could be used by sporting teams. Concern about strain on local amenities, including schools, medical facilities and shops Loss of trees, wildlife, flora and fauna in the area
Q28	Nicola Huxley [6123]		Objects to development on Sharmans Cross Road due to: Loss of much needed playing fields & sports facilities Added traffic congestion Affect on the character of the area Impact on the local amenities Adverse environmental impact The borough is sorely lacking in local sporting and recreational land
Q28	Nicola Moriarty [3622]		Traffic impact of extra cars on top of school traffic, impacting the potential safety of children at the school, at location of serious accidents. A large development of this size will only add pressure onto the already poor drainage system that just cannot cope with any heavy rainfall at the best of times Loss of valuable sports facilities - communities need to stay healthy and keep active Please allow someone to develop this site in a sporting capacity so that we can secure our children's health, fitness and future going forward.
Q28	Oliver Turley [4333]		Objection to Site 18: - Site has an existing covenant to be used for sporting purposes and ancillary facilities to sport. - Site should not be used for housing, but sport only - Density out of character with the surrounding area - Traffic Congestion will increase leading to increased dangers to pedestrians and cyclists - Parking Congestion Loss of green space with trees and wildlife
Q28	Patricia Mangan [3711]		there was an all-party policy agreement that the Rugby Ground would maintain the sports ground only covenant and that the freehold would not be sold, yet it has still been listed as available and suitable for new residential properties

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Patricia Mangan [3711]		This would have significant impact in the area in respect of traffic flows, particularly during rush house. More importantly there is already inadequate medical health care capacity and the Schools are already oversubscribed.I therefore would request that you to immediately remove the Rugby Club ground from the local development plans and that the site is retained as sports facilities.
Q28	Paul Ponsonby [4738]		Covenant that the site should be used for sporting purposes only should be retained and the site bought back into sporting use. Development would be out of character and scale with the surrounding development. Adjacent roads are already congested, more so at "school run" times. This will be exacerbated. Pressures on sewers, drains and roadside parking should prevent the proposal alone. The area cannot support any further over-development. Building on this land will destroy valuable green space and impact upon the landscape, established trees (some of which have preservation orders on them) and wildlife.
Q28	Paul Thompson [5836]		Opposed to any change or use or development of the Old Rugby Ground/Arden Tennis Club site: - Solihull is already gridlocked at certain times of the day - Environmental issues associated with additional development - Strain on sewerage/drainage systems - Several high density retirement developments already underway in Solihull - overall impact on quality of life for residents? - Need to keep our green spaces
Q28	Peter Butler [4234]		The above ground was brought Solihull Council and sold to a rugby club on condition that it would only be used for sport. In 2013 Solihull council affirmed as policy, not to sell the freehold or lift the covenants and that the ground should only be used for sporting purposes. The present owners have made no attempts to attract any one wishing to use the ground for sporting purposes, in fact it would appear they have positively discouraged it
Q28	Peter Jordan [5903]		- The covenant which states that the land must be used for sports uses should be honoured. This understanding was made in good faith by Solihull Council who are now honour bound to maintain this. - Adverse impact on the growth and future of Arden tennis

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Peter Morgan [6282]		Proposed housing densities are very high and out of character with surrounding neighbourhoods. The development is out of character with the area and would diminish Solihull's attractive distinctiveness This is an ideal site for engaging people in sport and physical activity. The area should be valued as an important area of open space - a green oasis - and somewhere that, with appropriate sports development, could be an important local hub for promoting health and physical recreation.
Q28	Peter Quinn [5616]		Traffic impact from high density development and the site is needed for recreational use and has been covenanted for this purpose.
Q28	Phillip Ellis [4183]		Objection to Site 18: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site should be retained for sporting use - Site important to local communities - Density out of character with surrounding area - Existing medical and school facilities are inadequate - Existing parking problems and dense traffic, particularly at peak periods - Greenfield sites should be retained and brownfield sites used instead
Q28	Phillip Leyland [3701]		Development will destroy character and local distinctiveness, create further parking problems in an area already besieged with traffic issues, create further drainage/flooding problems in an area of Sharmans Cross which already has severe drainage. Contravention of TPOs. Density is 4 to 5 times that of surrounding area. Results in further pressure of an already strained medical and schooling facilities. problems. Impact on existing sports club.
Q28	Phoebe Husband [5917]		Loss of the sports club and recreation field which is an attribute to the community Building houses on this site would be a major eye sore Parking problems on Sharmans cross road already exist, which may get worse Strain on schooling Damage to plant/tree life as it would be urbanised.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Professor Derek Sheldon [3955]		<p>It is vital that the 2013 all party policy on the Rugby Ground be retained. Density of proposal is too high, and is 4-5 times greater than the surrounding properties</p> <p>In the short/medium term it should be returned to sporting use for the good of the borough, or as a site for say a new school, again with appropriate sporting facilities.</p> <p>Surely with an increasing population and new school places SMBC should be seeking to retain its sporting grounds under such circumstances.</p> <p>There are so many other areas of the Borough that are available and not in the Green Belt.</p>
Q28	R J Griffiths [4285]		<p>I understand that the land is subject to covenants which stipulate that the land can only be used for sporting activities.</p> <p>Indeed, the council reaffirmed that these covenants would continue to be applied as recently as 2013. Sporting facilities make a significant contribution to the overall quality of life in the borough and should be protected for, not only the benefit of existing residents, but for generations to come. There are many proven health and social benefits that flow from the provision of these facilities and I hope that the council will reject the proposed development and encourage the land to be used as originally intended, as a valuable sporting resource.</p>
Q28	R S Windebank [4210]		<p>The density would be 4-5 times the surrounding area. Destruction of character and diminishing the distinctiveness of the area. Worsening already problematic traffic. TPO's, drainage and flooding on Sharmans Cross with Victorian drains not coping. Inadequate medical and school capacity. Future of tennis club uncertain. Dreadful for traffic from these properties to come out on to Sharman's Cross Road.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Rhys Ponsonby [4739]		<p>This is a site which should never have been included in the plan and must remain as a sporting facility.</p> <p>It has a covenant which restricts its use for sporting purposes only, this should be upheld in accordance with the provisions of the covenant and the 2013 all party policy on the rugby ground.</p> <p>The lessor should be made to put into effect the conditions of the lease rather than seeking to obstruct local clubs from using the land for sport by imposing extortionate fees to rent or use the facility.</p> <p>Proposed houses on the site would be totally out of keeping with the surrounding area and cause parking, congestion and drainage problems for the adjacent roads and houses.</p> <p>Would have a detrimental effect on the mature locality. We need to preserve our</p>
Q28	Richard Burbidge [4263]		<p>Objection to Site 18.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land MUST be retained for sporting purposes as outlined in the current lease with Oakmoor Estates Ltd - Development is out of character of the area - Drainage and flooding issues - Parking capacity is an issue - Lack of capacity of medical facilities - At present it is an overgrown eyesore that has been left to decay - needs to be used as sports facilities <p>I am actively saying NO to a residential development</p>
Q28	Richard Westman [4314]		<p>There is a shortage of pitches in Solihull - replacing with facilities of equivalent quality and accessibility - Will this be the case?</p> <p>Covenant that the ground should only be used for sporting purposes and that the Council not sell the freehold.</p> <p>To not maintain the sports ground would be a travesty to the local area- impacting the health, wellbeing and sporting opportunities for the people of Solihull</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Richard Young [4484]		<p>The site provides important outdoor sporting facilities and open space which benefits the community and wildlife.</p> <p>Development would create significant levels of noise and pollution both during construction phases and on completion, which would have a negative affect on the area</p> <p>Density would not be in keeping with the characteristics of the local environment.</p> <p>Existing road network around the site is unsuitable for handling the increased levels in traffic - leading to increased noise, pollution, congestion and risk to all road users and pedestrians.</p>
Q28	Rishi Jassal [3523]		<p>Valuable green space will be lost</p> <p>Traffic and congestion will worsen</p> <p>Schools and doctors will not cope & do not have capacity</p> <p>Loss of valuable sporting facilities</p> <p>Legal covenant in place names the site to be used as a sporting ground only</p> <p>Additional development will affect the privacy of the surrounding dwellings</p> <p>The site is flat, its boundaries contain mature vegetation and trees</p> <p>Sharmans Cross Road has been prone to flooding</p> <p>This proposed site will not be within walking distance to Solihull town centre or Solihull train station</p> <p>Development does nothing to protect and enhance the amenities of existing residents</p>
Q28	Robert Blond [3614]		<p>I demand' that the 2013 all party policy on the Rugby Ground on maintaining the sports ground only covenant and not selling the freehold be retained.</p> <p>The proposed plans would damage the future of the tennis/squash club, at a time when we should be encouraging sport</p> <p>The old rugby club would be an ideal football pitch if allowed, making sport easier and not relocating to out of the way places encouraging car-based travel.</p> <p>If development went ahead it would also damage the mature oaks and other trees and go against your tree preservation orders.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Roger Clench [4213]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Site should be retained for sporting use as per the covenant - The area is a much needed area for wildlife. - It is also much needed as a recreational area. - The TPO's should be preserved. - There would be inadequate medical and school capacity. - Issue with parking - It would destroy the character and distinctiveness of the area.
Q28	Roger Chapman [3972]		<p>Drainage concerns</p> <p>There are far too few green spaces in Solihull.</p> <p>Risk of accidents as a result of site access and egress.</p> <p>Traffic volumes will significantly increase and quiet roads around the area will become congested and potentially dangerous.</p> <p>Parking will become a major problem.</p> <p>A younger population will undoubtedly increase noise pollution and destroy the character of the area.</p> <p>Finally the drainage in the whole area is already on a knife edge and no doubt the effect of this development will have added complications which the Council will be</p>
Q28	Roger Flood [3937]		<p>Solihull is already poorly off for sports venues and, at a time when children and adults are encouraged to do more activity, the thought should be on expansion rather than on reduction of such facilities.</p> <p>Extra traffic in already congested area will increase risk to pedestrians, especially school children.</p> <p>Density far exceeds that in surrounding area and is out of character.</p> <p>Schools and medical services at capacity and unable to cope with additional influx.</p>
Q28	Roger Hopper [4132]		<p>Destruction of mature trees, some TPOs and natural habitats</p> <p>Objection to Site 18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing parking and traffic congestion issues - Medical facilities and schools already oversubscribed - Lack of suitable and sufficient sports facilities inn the Borough - Land should be used for sport and not housing <p>Pron</p>
Q28	Ron Edwards [4237]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sporting covenant on the land. Every effort should be taken to preserve sporting facilities. - Loss of public amenities and sporting facilities in the area - Density of housing out of character with surrounding area - Exacerbate existing traffic issues - Drainage/flooding already a problem

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle providing suitable relocation of sports facilities available. No commitment given to either deliverability or relocation. Playing pitches not in surplus in Solihull therefore development of the site uncertain.
Q28	Rose Conway [6214]		<p>My objection is based on the effect on local amenities such as schools and doctors and also the knock on effect on amenities in wider surrounding areas. Facilities are already at breaking point. The massive amount of building work that has already taken place in Shirley/Cheswick Green/Dickens Heath and other parts of Solihull has had a hugely detrimental effect on traffic and access to doctors etc.</p> <p>The pace of building work needs to be slowed unless amenities are in place and needs of existing residents need to be considered. Regard also needs to be given to features such as leisure facilities or green belt which give an area its character</p>
Q28	Rosemary Rowley [5730]		Traffic congestion and noise would be considerable and it would alter the feel of the area. The devastation to trees and wildlife also should be considered. The 'green' is what makes Solihull so special. The tennis club is a valuable asset to us the residents and the Rugby Ground should be used to its full potential. I demand that the 2013 all party policy on the Rugby Ground be maintained and that the freehold should not be sold or covenants lifted. The council has a duty to consider the wishes of its residents before the profits of developers.
Q28	Royden Hukin [4163]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land has a sports ground only covenant - Loss of sports facility - Lack of sports facilities in Solihull - Density too high and out of character with the area - Existing flooding issues - Existing traffic and parking issues: Sharman's Road/Streetsbrook Road junction <p>Pressure on oversubscribed medical facilities and school places</p>
Q28	Sarah Burling [6217]		<p>Area should be used for sporting purposes only</p> <p>Building more houses would only increase the need for such sporting facilities</p> <p>The council should insist that a realistic rent should be offered by Oakmoor and that they demand that the pitches be maintained in good order.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Sarah La Touche [4265]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land has a sports ground only covenant - Loss of sports facility - Density out of character with surrounding area - Existing congestion and parking issues - Sharmans Cross Junior School already full
Q28	Sharmans Cross Action Group (SXAG) (Mr Paddy Montague) [6252]		<p>Site should be preserved as a sports ground. The existing covenant still stands and residential redevelopment is contrary to this.</p> <p>The has been avoidance in allowing the pitches to be used; more sports facilities across the borough are being lost when health and well being are becoming more prevalent issues.</p> <p>Unlikely to get a replacement so close to communities served with required facilities, for the cost.</p> <p>The site is not sustainable.</p> <p>Flooding and drainage issues.</p> <p>Density out of keeping with surrounding area.</p> <p>Car parking problems will be exacerbated.</p> <p>School and medical services already oversubscribed.</p>
Q28	Sharon Anne Burbidge [4264]		<p>Objection to Site 16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The freehold on the site must also be retained & not sold on - Development will totally destroy the current character of the area. - Impact on the Victorian drains will become worse - Increased population would add strain to medical facilities - Schools oversubscribed - Parking issues - Density not in keeping with the rest of the area <p>Concern about future of Arden Tennis Club – should not be lost</p>
Q28	Shaun Friel [4199]		<p>Objection to Site 18:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land has a sports ground only covenant - Loss of sports facility - Density out of character with the area - Existing drainage and flooding issues - Local services oversubscribed - Existing traffic and parking issues

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Solihull Arden Club (Mr Richard Dumbleton) [5491]		<p>The club requires the following conditions to be met in order to have reassurance on the following before it could engage in meaningful dialogue regarding any potential whole site development with its members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tenure of the land occupied by the club comparable to existing arrangements i.e. Freehold, similar value, proximity for existing membership. 2. Beneficial improvements to the structure and buildings of the clubhouse and its associated playing and fitness facilities. 3. Ease of access into and out of the site. 4* Significant improvement regarding car parking arrangements. 5* Significant improvement to the club's potential for future sustainability.
Q28	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		<p>The proposed allocation is the former site of Birmingham and Solihull RUFC which previously contained two rugby pitches and associated changing rooms/clubhouse. The consultation document states that compensation for the loss of playing pitches will be required. Sport England agrees that mitigation would be required and this requirement should be incorporated with the policy that allocates the site. The appropriate mitigation provided should be reinvested in rugby union facilities across the Borough to help meet the deficits outlined in the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy.</p> <p>The design of the site should not prejudice the use of the adjacent tennis club.</p>
Q28	Stephen Clarke [4164]		<p>Detrimental impact on highway, pedestrian and cycle safety and the local roads will be even more difficult to cross as a result of additional traffic.</p> <p>Inadequate vehicle parking on site and in the area, leading to additional on-street parking and exacerbating the existing situation.</p> <p>Primary and secondary schools are oversubscribed.</p> <p>Extra traffic will create more pollution.</p> <p>Impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Out of character and scale with surrounding development.</p> <p>Loss of parking for tennis club.</p> <p>The covenant restricting use of the site for sporting use should be retained.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Steven Kentish [4005]		Impact of additional traffic on already congested area, especially at peak hours, including safety issues. Limited access point onto Sharmans Cross Road. Increased risk to pedestrians, in particular school children making their way on foot to Sharmans Cross School and other local secondary schools. Parking at school already very challenging. Hazardous to cyclists. Loss of parking for Arden Club. Increase in pollution. Serious detrimental impact from unacceptable over-development, density and design on character of area. Loss of environmental quality/natural habitats. Loss of sports pitches, contrary to covenant to retain. Drainage/flooding issues. Inadequate infrastructure.
Q28	Stewart Millman [4050]		Increase in traffic in already congested area, with associated pollution and danger to cyclists, pedestrians and also vehicular traffic from parking. Loss of community sports potential, which should be invested in to encourage participation in sport. Additional pollution contrary to SMBC's own Clean Air Strategy.
Q28	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle providing suitable relocation of sports facilities available. No commitment given to either deliverability or relocation. Playing pitches not in surplus in Solihull therefore development of the site uncertain.
Q28	Surinder Jassal [4381]		Objection to Site 18. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land should be retained for sports use/green space - Site not comply with accessibility criteria in the NPPF - TPOs should be retained and protected - Wildlife will be affected - Detrimental impact on character of area, will cause disruption, loss of light, privacy, traffic, potential crime, pollution, cleanliness - Increase in traffic, parking issues and pollution - Existing flooding issues - Schools and medical centres over-subscribed

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Susan Sloan [4122]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objection to Site 18 - Land should be retained for sport use - Highway infrastructure inadequate - Will exacerbate existing parking issues - Existing flooding and drainage issues - Inadequate medical and school facilities
Q28	Tajinder Lalli [5721]		<p>The Council should not renege on its commitment to only use the site for sporting use and should invest in the site for the benefit of the community. Already inadequate provision for young people to play sport outside of school. Even if pitches were reprovided, new out-of-town grounds would do very little to promote sport.</p> <p>The density is far in excess of the neighbouring development. Parking provision is less than that typically required in the average Solihull household.</p> <p>Pressure on existing infrastructure, in particular the school and the road. No provision for new infrastructure, for example a doctors surgery.</p>
Q28	Terry Lloyd [3710]		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Density will destroy character and out of scale overdevelopment. 2. Increased traffic and associated pollution, danger to cyclists, pedestrians and children accessing schools. Contribution to traffic congestion along Streetsbrook Road. 3. Parking - loss of parking for Arden Club, exacerbating already chaotic parking at peak school and sporting times. 4. Exacerbate flooding problems. 5. Permanent loss of sporting facilities when Borough already short of facilities.
Q28	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle providing suitable relocation of sports facilities available. No commitment given to either deliverability or relocation. Playing pitches not in surplus in Solihull therefore development of the site uncertain
Q28	Vernon Basford [3708]		Loss of sports pitches contrary to agreement/covenant.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q28	Vikki Sunner [4432]		<p>The 2013 all party policy for the Rugby Ground to maintain the sports ground covenant and not sell the freehold should be enforced.</p> <p>Development would be out of character and scale as surrounding development</p> <p>Additional traffic generated would cause additional disruption to commuters and residents and would impact on the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Existing parking issues would be exacerbated.</p> <p>Development would add to existing flooding issues.</p> <p>Local schools are oversubscribed.</p> <p>The site does not meet national criteria for access to local amenities.</p>
Q28	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		<p>Pow Grove LWS and ancient woodland has been identified within the concept plans; however it is unclear what size the semi-natural buffer is that has been left between the woodland and developable areas. The Ecological Assessment has recommended that this buffer is a minimum of 30m to protect the woodland from harm.</p> <p>We recommend that the concept plans are updated to be clear that the size of the buffer is 30m between the woodland and the development</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Meriden			
Q29	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		There is very limited provision for housing in this area in the plan. That is not to say that it is where more housing should go. It does however provide for very limited CIL payments to the community. The location does also play a very strategic role in enabling UK Central to reach its potential. As such sites in the area would have to be reviewed, alongside neighbouring authorities.
Q29	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q29	Meriden Parish Council (Cllr Melanie Lee) [6152]		<p>Following our consultation response in 2017, infrastructure issues remain: transport, traffic, schools, GP access, Post Office, banks.</p> <p>Primary school is limited in space already and the GP surgery is at capacity.</p> <p>Local transport facilities continue to dwindle, e.g. Ring and Ride</p> <p>Continued quarry expansion will increase quarry lorry movements that presently stand at 732 PER DAY.</p> <p>Further impacts need to be considered from possible HS2 Bridge across Meriden Road, Motorway Service Area, M42 junction 6, potential new developments in Hampton in Arden, Balsall Common and Eastern Green, all of which will increase traffic, noise, dust and pollution.</p> <p>With increasing traffic, it is a must that a turning circle be installed possibly at Strawberry Fields junction.</p> <p>With increased HGV use of Berkswell Road to commercial businesses sited in Berkswell, a pedestrian footpath should be installed between Heart of England Club and Berryfields.</p> <p>Need to take account of emerging Meriden NDP and supporting evidence.</p>
Q29	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q29	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		<p>I am dismayed that the "aspirations of the local people" as expressed in their emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan have been quoted as justification for allocating only 100 houses to Meriden. The aspirations of residents of Berkswell as expressed in their NDP - which has reached the stage of independant examination - have been ignored. The Local Plan takes no input from the Berkswell NDP.</p> <p>There is also the possibility of a new settlement west of Meriden at Cornets End which has been discounted although it is possible that this area is identified in the Hearn report.</p>
Q29	Mr J Davies [2104]		It seems logical that this area can sustain more development, instead of Shirley, for example, as it benefits from a more than adequate road network and could draw road use and services use away from the already crowded areas elsewhere in the plan.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q29	Mrs Lynn Parker [5769]		The access/egress via Maxstoke Lane to this site is totally unacceptable. The Lane is narrow as stated in SMBC site analysis, and already carries all traffic from Maxstoke Lane, Maxstoke Close and recently completed Gate Estate. 100 houses will put even greater pressure on Doctors Surgery, Schools and traffic in the village. The number of homes should remain at 50 as we were originally told. The McCarthy and Stone development is not the type of development needed/wanted. And any development must have an equal spread of Privately Owned, Affordable/Rented houses across the whole site regardless of multiple land ownership.
Q29	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Ok
Q29	Open Spaces Society (Mr Richard Lloyd) [5451]		<p>Master plan approach is welcomed, but should be extended to all part of the Borough. the master plans need to become more tightly defined during the further development of the Local Plan. Should show how the policies elsewhere in the Local Plan are to be implemented in each specific site. Should be clear allocation and protection of areas for public access, should be secured in perpetuity by the dedication of the land as a Village Green, or by dedication of access rights under section 16 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. There is no mention in the Draft Plan of the designation of Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF para 99</p> <p>In terms of green belt enhancements Potential improvements should be seen in the context of the agricultural use of much of the land, and of the prevailing Solihull Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2016 (ROWIP). Best possible standards and practice should be applied for the physical state of the path network. Registration of unrecorded access rights should be encouraged and expedited. The Local Plan should also define how funding derived from developers will be applied to the other aspects of enhancements to the Green Belt.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q29	Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd [400]	Arcadis (Mr Will Charlton) [3646]	<p>Agree Site 10 can provide for affordable and special needs housing, but should also provide market housing to meet needs of all groups. Development should contribute to local infrastructure. CIL funding should provide improved infrastructure or upgrading of public open space within village. Enhancements should consider reclamation/enhancement of areas subject to mineral working, which could also include further development, including land south of Site 10.</p> <p>Concept Masterplan Demonstrates good use of space for open space incorporating lake, but density should not be too high/out of keeping.</p>
Q29	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q29	Severn Trent Water (Elaine Ring) [6241]		<p>Severn Trent Water response: Results of our high level sewer capacity assessment highlights some possible risks of the proposed development on the sewerage and surface water network. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead.</p> <p>High Impact Sites: - Maxstoke Lane, Meriden</p>
Q29	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q29	Terra Strategic [5698]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	We disagree with the infrastructure requirements identified for Meriden and consider they should include provision for an expansion of the Primary School which is understood to be at capacity. This could be facilitated with the release of land north of Meriden between the existing settlement (and school) and the A45, including Site 81
Q29	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q29	West Midlands Police (Chief Constable) [5044]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The absence of positive references to the need to provide Police infrastructure undermines the delivery of safe and secure development. There should be express reference to the need for financial contributions towards additional expenditure burden placed on WM Police as a consequence of the proposed growth. Seek engagement in preparation of Concept Masterplans and policy implementation and delivery once Plan adopted.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Meriden			
Q30	Alan Lole [6299]		Concept Masterplan Impact of development on residents of Maxstoke Lane. Proposed access points should be reconsidered and more consideration given to residents if any construction takes place. Added traffic will worsen high risk associated with junction with Fillongley Road. There is a much more practical, logical and safe access/egress point available for this development.
Q30	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		In part. Plans would need to be refined with the local community. This is a strategically important location and as such should facilitate growth, alongside benefiting from HS2.
Q30	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		An ordinary watercourse forms the northern boundary of the site, however our 'Flood Map for Planning' only shows the flood risk from watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km ² , mapping of the risk from the watercourse has not been undertaken and as such this is the only reason the site is shown to lie in low risk Flood Zone 1. The assessment of flood risk and easement from the ordinary watercourse should be agreed with the LLFA, however we strongly recommend that hydraulic modelling of the watercourse is undertaken as part of a Level 2 SFRA to inform of the developable area and capacity of this potential allocation. Regardless of flood risk, we recommend an unobstructed green corridor is maintained along the banks of the watercourse for the purposes of protecting and maintaining green and blue infrastructure.
Q30	Frontier Estates [6274]	Gillings Planning (Hannah Pearce) [6273]	The principles of this site allocation in terms of the quantum of development and proposed density approach are supported. The allocation would be suitable for a range and type of housing across both C2 and C3 use classes which would include accommodation suitable for the elderly. This should be recognised within the emerging site allocation policy to confirm that the proposed 100 homes can include provision for C2 and C3, thereby conforming with the provisions of national policy.
Q30	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Agree in principle
Q30	IM Land [3900]	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs Rachel Best) [2448]	Site does not have capacity for 100 dwellings without significant harm to landscape character/biodiversity. Site part of green gateway to Meriden. Importance of trees/vegetation to setting recognised in LCA. Development would be uncharacteristic and loss of vegetation contrary to guidelines in LCA. No reference to potential LWS and how this is accommodated. Should consider other sites such as Site 420 North of Main Road which performs better in site assessments and has no biodiversity constraint.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q30	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Site has a number of constraints and increase in density will impact on more sensitive area to the north, be high for an otherwise semi-rural settlement and be incongruous with the guidance in the LCA. Restricting development to the less sensitive southern part and utilising an alternative site, Site 197 Berkswell Road would allow more appropriate smaller scale and lower density development
Q30	Meriden Parish Council (Cllr Melanie Lee) [6152]		Support inclusion of Site 10 and provision of affordable/special needs housing. Summary of our comments on draft concept masterplans: - 1ha allocated for open space, this should not be a balancing pond/SUDS with a path leading to nowhere - Proposal of 100 homes on remaining 2ha would equate to 50 dph, we think this density is too high. 3storey development would visually conflict with character of village. Need to respect site is gateway to village. - No. of parking bays conflict with draft Meriden NDP. - Vehicular access maybe better from Maxstoke Lane or Birmingham Road - Need for pedestrian crossing across Fillongley Road, by Maxstoke Lane, across to shops. - Insist that a comprehensive and collaborative approach be taken on this site with the landowners.
Q30	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Agree in principle
Q30	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		I support this site.
Q30	Mr J Kimberley [6232]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Support allocation of Site 10 as logical extension of Meriden that meets policy objectives and has least impact. Site is lower performing green belt, partly brownfield, has no constraints, high accessibility, is deliverable within a settlement identified for limited expansion, and is well-related to centre. Will contribute to identified local affordable housing need. Consider Site 119 as part of proposed allocation could come forward in isolation. Site Assessment for 119 incorrect; delete reference to contaminated land, should be part brownfield, and should not refer to indefensible boundaries, as include The Firs housing development, trees and hedgerows.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q30	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	No objection, but question whether 100 dwellings are Class C2 or Class C3 (as site being promoted by McCarthy and Stone). If accommodation is C2, what contribution does this make towards meeting the Council's overall housing requirement and what contribution, if any, it will make the overall affordable housing requirement?
Q30	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Agree in principle
Q30	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Agree in principle
Q30	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Agree in principle
Q30	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust (Mrs Annie Ottaway) [6049]		Loss of potential Local Wildlife Site which should be surveyed before a decision is made to allocate this site - precautionary principle should not allocate the site due to ecological constraint.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
North Solihull, Marston Green & Castle Bromwich			
Q31	Carol Atterbury [5828]		Objection to development SHLAA site 3 Simon Digby Existing traffic congestion particularly on Chester Road and a s a result of building <u>on old Simon Digby School site and strain on public services</u>
Q31	Colin Davis [3352]		The botched changes to the Chester Road at Chelmunds Cross and Hurst Lane need an urgent review. Particularly in light of HS2 construction traffic that will use the A452/ Chester Rd.
Q31	Councillor Cheryl Buxton-Sait [5127]		I am glad to see that the local plan recognises that Castle Bromwich has no further capacity for development without compromising the quality of the local environment and open spaces. The road infrastructure in Castle Bromwich should be re-looked at. There is a strong desire in the community for the section of Chester Road around Morrison's to be changed to improve traffic flow and <u>pedestrian safety</u>
Q31	Councillor Chris Williams [2087]		Support desire to improve Chelmsley Wood and Kingshurst centres. There is wasted/disused space above shops and around Stephenson Drive in CWTC. Agree need to improve access to public transport. Journey times to Birmingham/Solihull are very long. Public realm improvements much needed in places, but should not be solely linked to further development. Need to invest in public spaces to increase active travel, cycling and walking, and recreation. Further regeneration opportunities should not compromise existing open space such as playing pitches. Assessment of value of open spaces should include survey of use by residents as spaces are often popular and well-used.
Q31	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		In part. The Public Health approach to redeveloping Kingshurst Village Centre is to be commended. Similarly improving access to employment and public space enhancements are to be commended. "Sadly, there is limited space for development. This means that even small-scale developments will have the impact of <u>creating tension</u>
Q31	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		Poverty and Inequality should be the priorities to be tackled in these areas, particularly in the 3 regeneration Wards and pockets of Castle Bromwich. Life expectancy is 10 years less for someone born in Smith's Wood than in Knowle or Balsall Common.This needs to be tackled. The North of Solihull (North of the A45) has areas which suffer from inadequate bus services. These affect connectivity to Solihull Town Centre, other parts of the Borough, plus Birmingham, and other out of Borough areas. This affects job prospects.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q31	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q31	Kier Living Ltd [5867]		Call for Sites reference 341 is designated as a Green Space Site within the Solihull Local Plan (December 2013) and within the Draft Local Plan Review Proposal Map (November 2016). However, land not secured through respective applications and transferred to private ownership. No mechanism to secure public access, and visual amenity value limited and will be constrained further if permission for Medical Centre granted. Loss of open space proposal would not adversely affect supply of open space and would be clearly outweighed by benefits of housing contributing to Borough need.
Q31	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q31	Miss Emma Walker [5487]		The area is built up enough as it is lack of school spaces and doctors availability is very limited already not to mention the lack of green space already in the area.
Q31	Miss Yasmin Omara [5305]		The shops are mostly vacant and attract a lot of anti social behaviour new improved shops and nhs services would provide amenities that locals desperately need. New shops would also attract more people to go and use them and make residents of Kingshurst feel safer.
Q31	Mr R Hill [5374]		Council have closes 6 schools in the area and built houses on the sites All green spaces are being built on, no matter then size - there are no areas for children to play Traffic is gridlocked
Q31	Mrs B Hill [5375]		CFS 54 Clopton Crescent Depot & British Legion Club objection to further development on open green space in North Solihull and Existing Facilities are over crowded ,schools and doctors, lack of children's play space, traffic gridlock.
Q31	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		»» Jenson house site has Bosworth field on it.
Q31	Ms Susan Killeen [5337]		1. No space for kids to play 2. No room on estate for kids to play football Due to heavy parking. 3. Schools already overcrowded 4. Doctors may not be able to cope with more patients. 5. Community groups use the field 6. No open spaces for healthy exercise

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q31	Open Spaces Society (Mr Richard Lloyd) [5451]		Public space enhancements in the North of the Borough. While the availability of space is a major constraint, the high population density should justify a greater emphasis on the provision and maintenance of public space for recreation and amenity. A uniform standard should be applied across the Borough for defining requirements for public access and green space.
Q31	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q31	Severn Trent Water (Elaine Ring) [6241]		Severn Trent Water response: Results of our high level sewer capacity assessment highlights some possible risks of the proposed development on the sewerage and surface water network. For most developments we do not foresee any particular issues. Where we consider there may be an issue we would discuss in further detail with the Local Planning Authority. Once detailed developments and site specific locations are confirmed by local councils, we are able to provide more specific comments and modelling of the network if required. We will complete any necessary improvements to provide additional capacity once we have sufficient confidence that a development will go ahead. Medium Impact Sites: - Chelmsley Wood Shopping Centre - Jensen House, Auckland Drive
Q31	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q31	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q31	West Midlands Police (Chief Constable) [5044]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The absence of positive references to the need to provide Police infrastructure undermines the delivery of safe and secure development. There should be express reference to the need for financial contributions towards additional expenditure burden placed on WM Police as a consequence of the proposed growth. Seek engagement in preparation of Concept Masterplans and policy implementation and delivery once Plan adopted.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
North Solihull, Marston Green & Castle Bromwich			
Q32	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concept Masterplan recognises viability issues. To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed. Recommend that site 7 is not relied upon as an allocation for housing.
Q32	Cllr Jean Hamilton [6182]		I support the above site being included as an allocated site to provide a new village centre, including a health and well being centre and a community space. Housing should be affordable and include social housing and be built to complement the new village centre. Consultation responses should be reflected in the final design of the centre.
Q32	Colin Davis [3352]		The regeneration of Kingshurst Parade is long overdue. Please don't take any more green space in North Solihull when the plans are finalised.
Q32	Councillor Ben Groom [5131]		I strongly support this and suggest that any further delays to this would be unacceptable.
Q32	Councillor Chris Williams [2087]		We agree that redevelopment is needed here that could lead to more housing overall. However, this needs to be done sensitively and with respect to residents on Church Close in particular
Q32	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Yes. As stated, the approach taken by Solihull Council is to be commended. Where possible, there are opportunities for regeneration, as demonstrated by Kingshurst Village. Any housing contributions are more likely to be addressed by a similar approach than by urban extension or windfall.
Q32	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		I want to add to my earlier representation one or two more observations. Re Church Close/Colling Walk - there's now a possibility that all of the Colling Walk and Church Close houses except numbers 1 to 6 Church Close, will be demolished. Now though, I understand the developers may want to put the shops' service area backing to what is the school's service area. I'd not support this part of the development as these are perfectly good houses and what will happen to owners/tenants?. Social housing needs to be maximised, plus an SMBC owned space for VCS group use.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q32	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		The regeneration of a tired and neglected development is required. I do not usually support demolition of sites, but this is an exception. We must not see the loss of social or co-operative housing, and an around the Kingshurst Parade development, unless it can be shown to be better than refurbishment and extension; referring to houses in Church and School Close, within the boundary. The consultation and study covering the social, economic and environmental impacts of demolition and refurbishment now being undertaken, with reference to the local energy plan and housing standards, and in conjunction with residents is vital.
Q32	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		The regeneration of a tired and neglected development is required. I do not usually support demolition of sites, but this is an exception. We must not see the loss of social or co-operative housing, in and around the Kingshurst Parade development, unless it can be shown to be better than refurbishment and extension; also referring to houses in Church and School Close, within the boundary. The consultation and study covering the social, economic and environmental impacts of demolition and refurbishment now being undertaken, with reference to the local energy plan and housing standards, and in conjunction with residents is vital
Q32	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q32	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concept Masterplan recognises viability issues. To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed. Recommend that site 7 is not relied upon as an allocation for housing.
Q32	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concept Masterplan recognises viability issues. To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed. Recommend that site 7 is not relied upon as an allocation for housing.
Q32	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concept Masterplan recognises viability issues. To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed. Recommend that site 7 is not relied upon as an allocation for housing.
Q32	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q32	Miss Yasmin Omara [5305]		Kingshurst village centre is in dire need of being demolished. Providing new homes is also an excellent use of the space and the regeneration will make residents greatly happy.
Q32	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concept Masterplan recognises viability issues. To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed. Recommend that site 7 is not relied upon as an allocation for housing.
Q32	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concept Masterplan recognises viability issues. To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed. Recommend that site 7 is not relied upon as an allocation for housing.
Q32	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Concept Masterplan recognises viability issues. To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that they will be available and could be viably developed. Recommend that site 7 is not relied upon as an allocation for housing.
Q32	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q32	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q32	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
North Solihull, Marston Green & Castle Bromwich			
Q33	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Given stated uncertainty over the extent of the site available for development and hence its deliverability, it is inappropriate and unsound for site 15 to be allocated.
Q33	Birmingham City Community Trust (Mr Antony Isherwood) [5453]		I am writing to object to the planned residential developments highlighted above. Birmingham City FC Community Trust has developed an excellent working partnership with the Cars Area Together Team since August 2018. Whereby we provide a safe, secure and positive environment on the site named above for all members of the local community to engage in a variety of sporting activities which include weekly sessions as well as holiday camps for young people and community festivals during the year.
Q33	Cllr Jean Hamilton [6182]		A free school is to be built on the Jensen House/Auckland Drive site which is being retained for education purposes. I strongly move that the school field field should be retained for education and community use. It is open daily to the public and organised events are held daily weekly monthly and annually on the field. This usage adds to community cohesion, and provides opportunities to improve physical and mental well being for many. There's virtually no green space left in this the most densely populated ward in the borough it is vital the field is kept for the community.
Q33	Councillor Ben Groom [5131]		Supportive in principle, but only if the playing field is kept in full, given the lack of green space and unhealthy high people per hectare in the ward at present
Q33	Councillor Chris Williams [2087]		While not in Chelmsley Wood, we are concerned that development here could lead to loss of the site that is needed for a new school, or loss of playing areas in an area with a shortage of green space
Q33	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		No. This will increase density and housing concentration in an already built up area.
Q33	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		In addition to the field being used by Sports Teams and Local Community groups, it is also used by individuals to walk and enjoy; a big contribution is made to Community well being, a priority area in SMBC's Green Space Strategy. The boundary area includes Auckland Hall and the Kingfisher Public House. The Hall is a vital fulcrum of community energy and innovation ; home to many groups such as 'Safe and Sound' and 'The Big Local'. It includes the Summerfield Educational Facility and the former Primary School and if a new school is needed, it should locate to site15.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q33	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		<p>It was always suggested that this site would be kept for Educational Purposes. As part of the local plan, Educational facilities and infrastructure are vital to ensure that any new development works cohesively. The same should be said for the community facility at Auckland Hall which houses various groups (mentioned in earlier objection) and the KIngfisher Foodbank et al. These would need to be rehoused.</p> <p>Regarding the Sports Field, Sport England would require this to be replaced under mitigation nearby. However, Smith's Wood and the surrounding areas have very little green space for relocation of such a facility.</p>
Q33	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		<p>Paragraph 304 of the local plan states that "The residential areas of Castle Bromwich and Marston Green are already largely built up and as such there are limited opportunities for further development without compromising the quality of the environment and existing open spaces".The same must be said of Smith's Wood, the densest populated Ward in the Borough. The Bosworth Field site is not suitable for development. The field needs to be kept at all costs - it is used by Sports Teams (e.g. Solihull Moors) and local community groups for Fun Days.</p>
Q33	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		<p>Postscript to previous objections/comments: Via the Government's Free School Initiative, Solihull's bid was successful and the new Free School will be incorporated onto the former Bosworth Primary School site (this news was circulated on 11 March 2019). At present, it is unclear what will be refurbished or rebuilt, but the School will be on the Summerfield site (within Site 15). The adjacent school field was always kept with the proviso it would be used for Educational Facilities. In addition to the Sporting and Community elements, noted elsewhere, this site should not be considered for housing, but much needed Education/community/leisure.</p>
Q33	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q33	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The text accompanying the illustrative emerging masterplan for site 15, Jensen House, (page 92) of the masterplan document, states, 'Work is currently in progress to determine whether and to what extent this site may be available to accommodate residential development.' Given this stated uncertainty about deliverability of the estimated 50 dwellings and given the national policy requirement for allocated sites to be deliverable, it is inappropriate and unsound for site 15 to be included in the Solihull Local Plan Review.
Q33	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Given stated uncertainty over the extent of the site available for development and hence its deliverability, it is inappropriate and unsound for site 15 to be allocated.
Q33	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Given stated uncertainty over the extent of the site available for development and hence its deliverability, it is inappropriate and unsound for site 15 to be allocated.
Q33	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q33	Miss Emma Walker [5487]		The area is built up enough as it is lack of school spaces and doctors availability is very limited already not to mention the lack of green space already in the area. The proposed plan and the amount of houses they want to build is ludicrous and then put a small junior football pitch that's really not going to be that beneficial to anybody. Then land is currently used by dog walkers, clubs, children and used by the cars area to hold activities such as Fundays and carboots which brings our community together.
Q33	Miss Cassie Rowantree [5494]		With a lack of green space in the area already over crowding/heavily populated there's not enough room in our schools or doctors already. Keep our spaces, our kids need grass not concrete.
Q33	Miss Christine Iddles [5568]		This area is already densely populated with very little green space where children can play safely, residents have had access to Bosworth Wood school field since 2009 and it is well used. The proposed development will comprehensively reduce further what little recreational space we have. A further 50 properties will bring in more children with no where to play and add to the existing car parking problems. In addition the proposed road will create a road safety issue as currently residents can walk safely down both Alvis Walk and Lotus Walk with no traffic risk.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q33	Miss Joanne Barnett [5310]		Over subscribed doctors. Traffic issues in area. Lack of green area. Increase in anti social behaviour would be worsened should more houses be built.
Q33	Miss Sasha Rymer [5366]		The area is fenced and a safe place for activities Building here would create more traffic and parking problems It would be a waste of money to have to replace a green space somewhere else if there is already one that is used here.
Q33	Miss Stacey Lanchester [5559]		This land should not be built on.
Q33	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Given stated uncertainty over the extent of the site available for development and hence its deliverability, it is inappropriate and unsound for site 15 to be allocated.
Q33	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Given stated uncertainty over the extent of the site available for development and hence its deliverability, it is inappropriate and unsound for site 15 to be allocated.
Q33	Mr Bruce Johnstone [5483]		I am a local resident of Vauxhall Crescent, and do not want the green space built on as the local amenities can not support more housing... also taking up the last remaining green space for local children and pet owners. It will also obstruct my view of any open space!!!
Q33	Mr Geoff Malins [5618]		No - it should stay in educational ownership together with the field which is used by residents of The Cars area, Smiths Wood. SMBC put our area forward as deprived with few facilities in 2012 to get Lottery funding. Now they want to take away our biggest asset which we use for helping residents and children in our area with BCFC and Andy Warmington's valued help. Cars Area Together put a full programme of activities on for local children, plus car boots and fun days. Take this away and our area will suffer from no secure area for our children.
Q33	Mr Lee Treadwell [5501]		The site represents one of the last areas of open green space in the north of the borough, developing this space causes more problems than it solves. The additional housing can't be supplemented by the required infrastructure such as schools and medical facilities as there just isn't the room. It is a short term solution to one problem without clear forethought. The playing field is used by several sporting clubs and other groups too, without this facility a lot of these groups will cease to exist. Surely reinstating the school is the most sensible solution in this instance.
Q33	Mr Mark Thompson [5870]		The North of the borough has already been disproportionately focused on for housing needs with loss of precious green spaces. Any further development is resisted.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q33	Mr Savio Dsouza [3022]		<p>The sportsfield is currently used by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -kids for recreation -Various kids activities organised by the 'Cars Area' - Dog walkers -Adults for exercise and jogging. -Smiths wood football team for practice <p>I am against the idea of residential development. The kids have no space to play and the green spaces are in decline. The proposed road will run outside my house and the current pathway is used by kids to play and cycle.</p> <p>There is also a ex school attached to the field, which can be converted to a school again. It will be cost effective to do so.</p>
Q33	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Given stated uncertainty over the extent of the site available for development and hence its deliverability, it is inappropriate and unsound for site 15 to be allocated.
Q33	Mrs Aarti Dsouza [5569]		<p>Completely object.</p> <p>There is lack of green spaces as it is. Children, Adults and Dog walkers use it frequently. The local charity and the organisation of Cars Area organise activities for kids there.</p> <p>There is closed school currently on the property. Re start that school as there is lack of school spaces as it is.</p> <p>The proposed road outside my house(75 vauxhall crescent) I completely object, as there are bungalows in our crescent and it will not be safe for the elderly and kids.</p>
Q33	Mrs C Spelman MP [2073]		Playing fields on Auckland Drive - Residents want to retain green space for local children and are also concerned about the reduction in open community space in the area.
Q33	Mrs Jacqueline Hepworth [5842]		<p>Concerns about a road running past the side of my house. Will there be paths running alongside the planned roads?</p> <p>Air and noise pollution.</p> <p>Losing a safe green space to walk my dog.</p> <p>A number of people use this field for dog walking.</p> <p>Children use the field for a variety of organised activities as well as just going on there and using it to play on their own and if this is taken away they will play on the streets instead. (This is what happened before the field was opened all week voluntarily by a resident)</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q33	Mrs Kathryn Vigus [5859]		There is little green space for sports groups and residents in the area. We are concerned about buildings being built with close proximity to our property, blocking out sunlight and the possibility of our property being overlooked by other tenants. There is an ongoing problem with inadequate parking in the area which will be compounded with extra housing. We are concerned that more housing will put extra strain on utilities and services in the area such as doctors, council services and education provision.
Q33	Mrs Kay Corbett [6087]		If you build on the field there will be no place for children to play football on, walk dogs and just have a lovely place to go for a walk. It was used by my 2 daughters, we use the space for Car Boots which is ideal.
Q33	Mrs Lesley Duggan [5348]		Area is already overcrowded and this is the only green space left. There is nowhere else for children to play safely away from the road Leave Bosworth field alone please!
Q33	Mrs Sandra Malins [5345]		Lack of school facilities in the area already Cars Area Together use the field regularly for events & Fun Days - Helped by BCFC providing football coaching. Activities greatly help disadvantaged children in the area North Solihull has high intensity levels of housing. Mayor Andy Street wants priority placed on land not in use -NOT on treasured green spaces
Q33	Ms Susan Killeen [5337]		Jenson house site has bosworth field on it. No space for kids to play No room on estate for kids to play football Community groups use the field
Q33	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q33	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		<p>The proposed allocation includes playing field land and the consultation document states that if lost as part of a development proposal would need to be mitigated. The SMBC illustrative emerging concept masterplan indicates that part of the playing field land will be lost with a junior football pitch being retained.</p> <p>The allocation of this site is objected to as the playing field is not deemed to be surplus to requirement.</p> <p>Site falls within the Birmingham and Solihull Local Delivery Pilot. Recent LDP consultation identifies that the playing field site provides an opportunity help achieve physical activity and community activism.</p>
Q33	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle
Q33	The Cars Area (Aimee Mallinson) [4203]		Building on this area would make a huge impact on the area. It would affect the organised activities provided to residents within the area and further afield as these would have to cease and would therefore have a negative effect on the youth in the area. The community fun day which brings together the community would have to be cancelled as there is nowhere else to run it. It is a safe open space for everyone to use which families, sport leaders and dog walkers like as there's only 1 entrance area to watch.
Q33	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No objection in principle

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Green Belt			
Q34	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Agree appropriate to consider. washed over designation for Whitlock's End should be removed and new boundaries defined. Settlement does not make an 'important contribution' towards the openness of green belt, as the Green Belt Assessment of lower performing parcel indicates. Introducing settlement boundaries provides opportunity for small or medium sized windfall sites, such as Call for Sites reference 116 rear of 146-152 Tilehouse Lane, which should be removed from the green belt .
Q34	Birmingham City Council (Mr Martin Dando) [5352]		BCC support the proposal in the Consultation document to remove certain villages/settlements from their current status of washed over green belt to help boost windfall housing provision and help maximise the delivery of sustainable homes.
Q34	Bloor Homes [6243]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	Support removal of Tidbury Green from the Green Belt to provide opportunities to deliver additional development and make better use of land which is currently constrained. Support the Council's recognition that Tidbury Green "does not have an open character that makes a contribution to the openness of the Green Belt". The Council should revisit the strategic position that Tidbury Green holds in terms of supporting future housing growth and connections to Whitlocks End station via Site Allocation 4. A strategic allocation and a removal of Green Belt wash should determine the boundary revisions that should be made to the settlement.
Q34	Brian Henry Garman [5873]		I am responding to the Consultation regarding the proposed downgrading of the Green Belt land in Widney Manor Road, that includes my property. My view is that there appears to be no need to change the status of this relatively small area of land and leave it open to possible development. I strongly believe that the Planning Inspector's decision (Appeal Ref: App/Q4625/A/10/2133554) to dismiss the appeal in respect of an outline application for residential development on land r/114-118 Widney Manor Road and the reasons for it in 2011 still apply. The protection of Green Belt status should stand.
Q34	Colin Davis [3352]		How can anyone comment when there are no maps of the new boundaries. Green belt status should be retained and a more transparent process of consultation on the green belt undertaken before any changes are made.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		This section has not been delivered in an appropriate manner to elicit valuable contributions. The wording is confusing, and I expect there will be fewer responses, though with greater inconsistency. If so, this will raise questions over the contribution that responses to this section make to the consultation. This can be addressed, in future, with an explanation that would adhere to the Crystal Mark standard of Plain English. Mapping alongside the questions is a simple addition that would elicit clearer and more indicative responses.
Q34	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		I find that this question will prove quite confusing and should be scaffolded so the average resident could understand the terminology. The terms need to be explained clearly. Maybe these be mapped alongside questions, to make it more clear what is required in the answer.
Q34	David Whiteley [5507]		Widney Manor Road - The Green Belt status of this land should remain because: 1.The land in question is a wildlife corridor that supports badgers, bats, foxes, muntjac deer etc. These animals are picked up regularly by our wildlife camera. 2. The road infrastructure cannot take the additional traffic congestion and access issues which would result, particularly the junction at Widney Lane/Widney Manor Road and railway station access. Accidents at this spot are a regular occurrence and there is not enough room to add a traffic island. 3. Additional light, noise and environmental pollution would add to the current incessant road and rail pollution.
Q34	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Support proposal. Significant areas of growth are now proposed for these settlements with the likely result being small pockets of land which no longer fulfil a Green Belt function. For this reason, we do not consider it appropriate to remove just the built-up areas of the settlements themselves but to review the Green Belt boundaries as a whole in this area. Green Belt is a function and if adjoining parcels of land no longer serve that function then they should be removed from the Green Belt - adequate protection can be provided without the need for a formal Green Belt designation. Given this is a non-statutory consultation, any review should occur with the identification and allocation of sites.
Q34	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		we accept the logic of removing washed over green belt status on these settlements particularly so on the Whitlock's End site back through to the Park & Ride with indications that local residents would support this.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Dickens Heath Residents Association (Trevor Eames) [6245]		The Residents Association support the policy proposals at Whitlock's End and Cheswick Green subject to careful assessment of flooding issues at Cheswick Green sites.
Q34	F D Muntz [6206]	Hancock Town Planning (Mr Joel Hancock) [1937]	CFS ref: 328 Land at and r/o 84, 86 & 90 School Road, Hockley Heath Supports removal of site from green belt. Unless the change were made, site 49 would be an isolated 'island' of Green Belt land surrounded by built development. However believes it should be removed irrespective of whether the allocation of land south of School Road is confirmed. Land is bounded by extensive built development to the west and east and partially to the north. Is a small gap within otherwise largely built up area. site does not extend beyond current extent of Hockley Heath. Is not within open countryside, bounded on three sides. Row of trees on the frontage would be retained. Would not conflict with green belt purposes of preserving the historic setting of towns or assisting in urban regeneration. Site should be specifically allocated for residential development due to its accessibility and lack of site specific constraints. Has no viable use as part of an agricultural holding and would assist in diversifying housing supply in accordance with the NPPF.
Q34	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Agree that the settlements/areas should be removed from the Green Belt
Q34	Ian Hazlehurst [6104]		I object strongly to the proposal to change the Green Belt status of land bordering Widney Manor Road. Solihull Council Planning Committee refused planning permission on land to the rear of 114- 118 Widney Manor Road in July 2010.This Application was dismissed on appeal in 2011. The reasons given included the harm the proposal would do to the Green Belt. No justification in removing the GB designation (205&308). The moving of the GB would have not apparent benefit other than to property speculators This draft Plan demonstrates a method of generating growth by 'Garden Grabbing'.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Ivan Lewis [5945]		<p>Widney Manor Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I would like to register my strongest objection to the possibility of the Green Belt status changing. - Widney Manor Road is a unique road within Solihull and indeed has been referred to well outside the borough for its charm and character despite being so close to Solihull Town Centre. - Back garden development(s) would change character of area <p>Few people on Widney Manor Road have been consulted on this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whole topic of changing green belt areas across Solihull is not just for people living within a small distance of said sites it is for everyone living in the borough. - Council's should assess alternatives to giving up Green Belt. ie.'brownfield sites'. - Land in question includes a wildlife corridor which has seen significant improvement in the numbers of badgers, deer etc since the last applications for back garden devt was submitted some 9 years or so ago. - Please keep me informed regarding the next stages of the consultation process.
Q34	Jeanette McGarry [4247]		<p>Concerned over the proposal to remove the green belt status of the land to the east of the Berkswell Windmill within the line of proposed new Balsall Bypass road. it is stated that it is not intended to release this land for housing. if that is so, why is it necessary to remove it from the Green Belt? It would be far better to retain both areas east and west of Windmill Lane within the Green Belt and take action to enhance their green belt status, rather than dismiss them offhand as low quality green belt as the proposals do.</p>
Q34	Joelle Hill [4425]		<p>Tidbury Green has already seen substantial development and should not be increased any further.</p>
Q34	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	<p>In the specific circumstances the washed over Green Belt status of settlement/areas should be removed since it will make for a more rational, logical and defensible boundary to the West Midlands Green Belt where it is situated within Solihull.</p>
Q34	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Appropriate to consider whether washed over green belt is still in line with strategic policies. I t is inappropriate to include settlements that do not make an important contribution towards the openness of the green belt.</p>
Q34	Mark Taft [3595]		<p>We believe these washed over boundaries should be removed.</p>
Q34	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Agree that the settlements/areas should be removed from the Green Belt</p>
Q34	Miss Susan Hillitt [5660]		<p>No Green Belt status should ever be removed. Are we to return to pre war days when people existed in tenements?</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Agree appropriate to consider. washed over designation for Whitlock's End should be removed and new boundaries defined. Settlement does not make an 'important contribution' towards the openness of green belt, as the Green Belt Assessment of lower performing parcel indicates. Introducing settlement boundaries provides opportunity for small or medium sized windfall sites, such as Call for Sites reference 116 rear of 146-152 Tilehouse Lane, which should be removed from the green belt
Q34	Mr Russell Blake [6189]		Washed over status of the areas listed can be removed. I am not able to state where new boundaries should be.
Q34	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Appropriate to consider whether washed over settlements should be retained in green belt.
Q34	Mr Bruce Richard [5691]		Widney Manor Road - Identified as not having an 'open' character. This conflicts with findings of the Solihull Green Belt Assessment 2016, the LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt 2011 and an appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road. The potential inclusion of this land would not create a logical boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places.
Q34	Mr Darren Douglas [5276]		We object to the possible removal of the Green Belt status of Widney Manor Road. We also strongly object to the possible inclusion of the land at Widney Manor Road and in particular, the rear of 114 to 118 Widney Manor Road, Solihull. The Inspector's overall conclusion is that the significant harm that would be caused (which includes through loss of openness) would not be outweighed by provision of housing on this site.
Q34	Mr David Patterson [5526]		Widney Manor Road - Identified as not having an 'open' character. This conflicts with findings of the Solihull Green Belt Assessment 2016, the LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt 2011 and an appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road. The potential inclusion of this land would not create a logical boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places.
Q34	Mr Eamon Maguire [5259]		i do not want any of our sports ground lost -your own rules prevent this P20 you were building on 4 and only replacing 2 we should be encouraging our kids to play sports

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Mr Graham Cockroft [5780]		Cheswick Green parish has very strong green belt boundaries. It is all washed over with the exception of Blythe Valley and the anomaly of Mount Dairy Farm. Removal of green belt wash over status, together with site 12 development, would leave a very patchy bit of green belt with vague boundaries that could not fulfil the main green belt purposes. In practice this would make it much easier for Cheswick Green to be engulfed by the conurbation in future, contrary to current green belt policy and that expressed in the draft plan. Infill sites must be considered on merit.
Q34	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		The green belt serves an essential purpose which has not changed since introduction. No exceptional circumstances exist for any development
Q34	Mr J Davies [2104]		Whilst I support this planning item, it should include a better means of access to the station car park as there are many delays in that section of road. Also, there needs to be much better room for bus stops along that busy road where many children congregate when waiting for school buses. (Shirley/Whitlock's End?)
Q34	Mr Jon Sellars [5962]		GREEN BELT MUST BE PROTECTED AT ALL COSTS!!! Why are you insisting on destroying green belt land - this must be protected. When it is gone - it is gone forever! <u>What provisions are you making to replace any that you are destroying</u>
Q34	Mr M Trentham [2114]		YES I welcome the Council's approach in para 376 to revise some parts of the Green Belt boundary to make it more logical, and to open up windfall development opportunities. I support the removal from Green Belt of the areas listed in para 378 together with those referred to in Q10 and Q21, and any others referred to in later chapters. It is highly desirable that Green Belt boundaries are logical, up to date, likely to be permanent, and where at all possible follow firm physical features, such as roads, rail lines, motorways, etc.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Mr Phillip Griffiths [5939]		<p>Widney Manor Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly object to the possible removal of the Green Belt Status of Widney Manor Road. - Not clear if the land proposed to be removed is just site 134 or sites 205 and 308 too. - Do not see how r/o 114-118 Widney Manor Road could provide any compensation provision given its size and shape. - Paragraph 378 of the consultation document is in contrast to the Solihull Strategic Green Belt Assessment (July 2016). This evidence base has been ignored in the assessment. - Removal of the Green Belt status would be contrary to: the Solihull LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt Submission (October 2011); the previous planning application that was refused on the site r/o 114-118 Widney Manor Road in July 2010 and the Appeal decision (APP/Q4625/A/10/2133554) that was dismissed on the site in 2011. The position has not changed since these assessments. - the embankment and wildlife corridor adjacent to the 'Spinney development' may be adversely affected. - Proposal would not create a logical roll back of the Green Belt boundary as land to the north and south would remain in Green Belt. - Exceptional circumstances required by paragraphs 135 and 136 of the NPPF (2019) do not exist.
Q34	Mr Richard Batchelor [5942]		<p>Widney Manor Road</p> <p>Changing the status would give developers a way in Planning permission for development of the land behind 114-118 Widney Manor Road was refused in 2010. The traffic considerations in that appeal were not considered significant, but the situation in the road needs more detailed assessment before any development is considered.</p> <p>It is good to see that the land to the east of the road remains in the green belt and forms a green corridor out of town maintaining the "urbs in rure" spirit of Solihull. Development such as that suggested by Rainier Developments - see https://www.rainierdevelopments.co.uk/strategic-land/widney-manor-road-solihull/ should be non-starters.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Mr Richard Deane [5510]		Tilbury Green should be washed over by green belt. It has been developed more disproportionately than other areas. Serious issues with coealecing areas. Significant flooding risk, particularly as climate change accelerates. Country roads are now more like main roads, unable to manage with volumes and safety for other road users, pedestrians cyclists etc. Negative impact on wildlife, and landscapes. There is a serious question about why Tidbery Green has been developed more greatly than other areas, in order to meet affordable housing needs, with the lack of infra structure and employment?
Q34	Mr Richard Wharton [5673]		Impact on wildlife- rare birds and topography Highways and access - already extremely busy road that cannot take any more traffic from further local developments. Repeated traffic incidents on junction Widney Manor Road/ Lovelace Avenue/Widney Lane often unreported due to non injury with regular excessive speeding traffic. Obvious devaluation of existing properties with potential loss of privacy to rear of property Inappropriate development in green belt
Q34	Mr Robin Easterby [5943]		Please see attached letter. This is a blatant attempt at Garden Grabbing!! (Letter not attached on JDi. Email sent 09.05.19 to respondent, Robin Easterby via PSP email address. Email reply on 09.05.19 stating that he was unable to resend letter but..."I suspect you may already have seen similar contents from other objecting residents on Widney Manor Road as it was a standard letter recommended by the Widney Manor Action Group. Basically I object to the proposed development as it would fundamentally change the nature of the area, is green belt, and is an example of garden grabbing at its worst. The traffic along Widney Manor Road has dramatically increased since I moved into 136 and the proposal will only make matters worse."
Q34	Mr Roger Grainger [5515]		This is contrary to Government Policy, and would lead to coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlock End, Majors Green and Bromsgrove District
Q34	Mrs C Richards [5412]		Our village has a true village feel about it and needs to be kept as such. We need to keep what green belt land around us as it is to retain a village status and the village community that we have.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Mrs Christine Halstead [5291]		<p>I object to the removal of Green Belt Status for land to the rear of 184 Widney Manor Road.</p> <p>The site provides nesting for a large variety of birds and sanctuary for animals including deer, foxes, badgers and bats.</p> <p>The mature trees within the site reduce pollution levels from the high volume of nearby traffic.</p> <p>The site is not appropriate for development as access is extremely close to the busy Widney Manor Road/Widney Lane Junction and adjacent to the entrance to Widney Manor Station Carpark. I believe the use of this access for vehicles would be potentially dangerous.</p>
Q34	Mrs Clare Heath [5871]		<p>Widney Manor Road - Identified as not having an 'open' character. This conflicts with findings of the Solihull Green Belt Assessment 2016, the LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt 2011 and an appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road. The potential inclusion of this land would not create a logical boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places.</p>
Q34	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		<p>Tidbury Green should be retained as a "washed over" Green Belt status as there has more an excess of recent development which has adversely affected the character of the settlement. Widney Manor, Whitlocks End and Cheswick Green should be removed from the "washed over "allocation to allow for some smaller developments that would not affect the openness of the Green Belt and add to the housing land supply.</p>
Q34	Mrs Johanna Sahi-Proto [5391]		<p>We object to the possible removal of the Green Belt status of Widney Manor Road.</p> <p>Solihull Strategic Green Belt Assessment - Assessment Report, July 2016 - report does not recommend removal of this area of land from the greenbelt</p> <p>Solihull LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt Submission October 2011 states "the land contributes to openness and to prevention of urban sprawl from the urban area to the west. This is supported by an Appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road dated 19th April 2011"</p>
Q34	Mrs Katrina Jamieson [5817]		<p>No more building on Widney manor road at all between the station and the 6th form college</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Mrs Lisa Mitchell [5498]		Widney Manor Road - Identified as not having an 'open' character. This conflicts with findings of the Solihull Green Belt Assessment 2016, the LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt 2011 and an appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road. The potential inclusion of this land would not create a logical boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places.
Q34	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		Taking these areas and Lady Byron and Grove Road out of the washed over Green Belt would open the way to potentially swallowing up larger areas of adjacent land with further loss high quality landscape and rural character.
Q34	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		These areas have changed in character and should be taken out of green Belt.
Q34	Mrs Pamela Robertson [5736]		Allowing further residential development to the rear of 114-118 Widney Manor Road would set an unwelcome precedent for further green belt land lost in the surrounding area. solihull would then be joined with Bentley Heath, Knowle and Dorridge Solihulls motto URBS IN RURE, town in the countryside, will no longer be valid.
Q34	Mrs Ruth Wolinski [5727]		Amber Site A7 - We object to the possible removal of the green belt status of Widney Manor Road and strongly object to the possible inclusion of the land at the rear of 114 to 118 Widney Manor Road. The consultation document paragraph 378 refers to WM Road as being a washed over settlement/area as it does not have an open character. This is goes against the findings of Solihull Strategic Green Belt Assessment July 2016, Solihull LDF Core Strategy. Assessment of Green Belt Submission Oct 2011 and the Appeal Inspector's decision relating to the land at 114-118 WM Road.
Q34	Mrs Sarah Oakley [5333]		Whitlock's End - Frontage developments on Tilehouse Lane and Houndsfield Lane that accommodates around 30 dwellings and the park & ride station just to the north. I would support the removal of the green belt status for all of this site including the surrounding properties in Tilehouse Lane and Houndsfield Lane. This area does not have an open character that makes a contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. A number of our neighbours also support this and are also considering submitting some of their land as part of the extended call for sites.
Q34	Ms B Bird [2065]		I comment only on the Widney Manor Road site as I am not familiar with the others. This area is very close to the M42 and I feel that it has less value as green Belt..

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Ms Rebecca Hess [5754]		We strongly object to the possible inclusion of land behind 114-118 Widney Manor Road. This land clearly does contribute to openness of the Green Belt and there are important reasons behind the aesthetic to preserve it: there are plants and wildlife that will be lost if we do not protect this. One of the most valuable and unique characteristics of Solihull as a suburb is that there is greenbelt so near to the centre of town where bats, slow-worms, badgers and deer reside. Damaging this ecosystem would set a very dangerous precedent, as previously agreed by the Council.
Q34	NaCSBA (Mrs Sally Tagg) [6115]		NaCSBA consider there is a strong opportunity to use the green belt designation to promote the types of homes needed within the borough. For example, the green belt designation could remain but the emerging plan could contain a policy which states that on infill sites and within villages in the green belt starter homes, affordable homes and self/custom build homes will be supported. This will prevent unrestricted urban sprawl as per the purpose of the green belt whilst allowing modest, small-scale developments of the type for which there is greatest need. An example is Policy H3 in Coventry City Local Plan. Washed over area of green belt should not be removed however a policy should be included stating Custom, self build, starter and affordable homes will be considered acceptable as part of limited infill within existing ribbon developments within the Green Belt where it is demonstrated that they do not have an adverse impact upon the openness and integrity of the wider Green Belt.
Q34	Nic Heath [5576]		Widney Manor Road - Identified as not having an 'open' character. This conflicts with findings of the Solihull Green Belt Assessment 2016, the LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt 2011 and an appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road. The potential inclusion of this land would not create a logical boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places.
Q34	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		Yes. However it is essential that special circumstances should prevail to justify this - either in the form of a roll back of the Green Belt to facilitate provision for infilling to enable achievement of housing targets, or to accommodate specific allocations of development sites such as the land at the rear of 114 to 118 Widney Manor Road.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	In terms of Tidbury Green, yes, its washed over Green Belt should be removed. Further to this, given the matters we have raised above, we consider there are also exceptional circumstances to justify our Client's site being removed from the Green Belt. We suggest that the new Green Belt boundary runs along Rumbush Lane to the east and along the line of Big Dickens Wood and the new landscape buffer proposed between our site and Dickens Heath Sports Club.
Q34	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	We consider that the revisions to the Green Belt boundary around Widney Manor Road should go further, with the new boundary located east of our Client's site along up to the Local Nature Reserve, as set out in our answer to question 2. We consider that given the nature of the site, and the contribution the affordable-led development will make to the Council's overall affordable housing requirements, this constitutes the exceptional circumstances required to justify this change to the Green Belt.
Q34	Rev Sean Loone [5295]		Opposition to the change in Green Belt status via Question 34 of the councils proposal from resident at 182 Widney Manor Road. In summary my objections relate to: Conservation - protected species bats and badgers Environmental - increased pollution and traffic <i>The council has a legal and moral duty to protect green belt areas</i>
Q34	Richard Lloyd [2616]		The new boundaries should be drawn tightly around the currently-developed curtilages, and Local Green Space designation should be used to provide continued protection of valued areas within the settlements.
Q34	Richborough Estates [3816]	Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]	Support Cheswick Green being removed from the Green Belt and propose land east of Tanworth Lane is allocated for housing to meet Plan period needs or safeguarded for longer-term development. Settlement benefits from public transport and local facilities including primary school, shops, public house, community hall and sporting facilities. Accessibility and sustainability recognised by allocation of Mount Diary Farm in SLP2013.
Q34	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Yes the washed over status of these settlements should be removed
Q34	Simon Taylor [4550]		#NAME?
Q34	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Agree Removal
Q34	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Agree that the settlements/areas should be removed from the Green Belt

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Stratford on Avon District Council (Rosemary Williams) [5853]		It would have been helpful if maps showing the location and extent of the five settlements to be removed from the Green Belt had been provided. SoA DC is not able to properly assess the impact to the wider Green Belt of their removal and therefore reserves the right to comment further if necessary. The Council notes the requirement (NPPF) to establish defensible long-term boundaries to the Green Belt. This consultation is not considering the issue of housing numbers or the Birmingham shortfall, SoA DC respectfully queries to what extent proper decisions can be taken as to what settlements to inset from the Green Belt when the strategic context is still unknown?
Q34	Summix (FHS) Developments Ltd [4455]	Framptons Planning (Mr Greg Mitchell) [2685]	<p>Concern over the way Fulford Hall Farm has been assessed within the site assessment report in relation to its contribution to the green belt and visual sensitivity. Significant errors in site assessment for Site 313. Step 1 should be priority 6 as accessibility high and moderately performing in Green Belt Assessment. Step 2 important judgements on green belt/landscape not based on robust evidence.</p> <p>Assigning Broad Areas score of 3 for Purpose 3 in GBA is flawed/unsound and artificially inflates score. Evidence provided demonstrates site has limited impact on Purpose 3 and would not undermine remaining green belt.</p> <p>Methodology to establish visual sensitivity in LCA muddled/poorly justified with no explanation how classification criteria assessed/judged. High classification based on ancient woodland not evident within site, whilst sub-urban influences in/around settlement ignored. Detailed robust evidence provided to show site well-contained, capable of accommodating development with limited visual impacts.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Susan Roberts [5924]		<p>Widney Manor Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly object to the possible removal of the Green Belt Status of Widney Manor Road. - Not clear if the land proposed to be removed is just site 134 or sites 205 and 308 too. - Do not see how r/o 114-118 Widney Manor Road could provide any compensation provision given its size and shape. - Paragraph 378 of the consultation document is in contrast to the Solihull Strategic Green Belt Assessment (July 2016). This evidence base has been ignored in the assessment. - Removal of the Green Belt status would be contrary to: the Solihull LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt Submission (October 2011); the previous planning application that was refused on the site r/o 114-118 Widney Manor Road in July 2010 and the Appeal decision (APP/Q4625/A/10/2133554) that was dismissed on the site in 2011. The position has not changed since these assessments. - the embankment and wildlife corridor adjacent to the 'Spinney development' may be adversely affected. - Proposal would not create a logical roll back of the Green Belt boundary as land to the north and south would remain in Green Belt. - Exceptional circumstances required by paragraphs 135 and 136 of the NPPF (2019) do not exist.
Q34	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		<p>The status of Cheswick Green, Millison's Wood, Tidbury Green, Whitlock's End and Widney Manor Road should be determined in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 139).</p>
Q34	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>The proposed removal from the Green Belt of the settlement of Tidbury Green and the properties along Widney Manor Road would be fully supported providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The properties along Norton Lane up to Rumbush Lane were to be included within the new inset area, Norton Lane providing the southernmost Green Belt Boundary b) All the properties along Widney Manor Road being taken out of the Green Belt with the eastern boundary of the Green Belt being relocated from the railway line to Widney Manor road.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q34	Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss Charlotte Kirby) [2531]		<p>Tidbury Green Should be retained as "washed over" Green Belt as there has been more than an excess of recent development which has adversely affected the character of the settlement.</p> <p>Cheswick Green, Whitlock's End, Widney Manor Road Should be removed from the "washed over" allocation to allow for some smaller developments that would not affect the openness of the Green Belt and add to the housing land supply.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Green Belt			
Q35	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		This section has not been delivered in an appropriate manner to elicit valuable contributions. The wording is confusing, and I expect there will be fewer responses, though with greater inconsistency. If so, this will raise questions over the contribution that responses to this section make to the consultation. This can be addressed, in future, with an explanation that would adhere to the Crystal Mark standard of Plain English. Mapping alongside the questions is a simple addition that would elicit clearer and more indicative responses.
Q35	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		I'm not sure a resident would understand this question. I'm struggling. Please explain.
Q35	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The washed over status of the settlements should remain.
Q35	Gill Corns [4448]		I agree that the dwellings in Grove Road should remain a "washed over" Green Belt and that the land to the north between Grove Road and Knowle centre should be retained as Green Belt providing a clear boundary to the existing residential area of the village.
Q35	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	- It is the correct time to undertake a wholesale and detailed Green Belt boundary review as this can only be re-defined through a Local Plan Review. - Opportunity to rationalise and re-define boundaries that were designated within the a very diferent pl
Q35	Michael Watkinson [3576]		Small ancient villages such as Berkswell are a natural part of the British countryside and are undoubtedly a part of the green belt.
Q35	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The washed over status of the settlements should remain.
Q35	Mr Russell Blake [6189]		Green belt status should be retained in these cases.
Q35	Mr & Mrs Williams [6253]	Oakwood Planning Ltd (Mrs Jayne Cashmore) [5447]	The Council's approach is overly restrictive compared to the NPPF. The NPPF allows for limited infilling in villages and this should be the case throughout the Borough when housing is to be delivered and reliant on Green Belt sites. This is even more so the case if the Council intends not to allocate any Small Sites (see Q39 comment)
Q35	Mr Adrian Baker [3433]		I agree that the dwellings in Grove Road should remain a "washed over" Green Belt and consider that the land to the north between Grove Road and Knowle centre should be retained as Green Belt to provide a clear boundary to the existing residential area of the village.
Q35	Mr Bob Holtham [3530]		The washed over status gives the protection needed against inappropriate green belt development and limits further encroachment and sprawl.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q35	Mr Brian Hillman [6003]		Grove Road should remain washed over green belt and the land to the north between Grove Road and Knowle centre should be retained as Green Belt to provide a clear boundary to the existing residential area of the village settlement.
Q35	Mr David Power [5941]		I agree that the dwellings in Grove Road should remain a "washed over" Green Belt and that the land to the north between Grove Road and Knowle centre should be retained as Green Belt to provide a clear boundary to the existing residential area of the village.
Q35	Mr Gregory Lowson [5960]		Grove Road should certainly remain washed over green belt for all of the reasons cited by the Knowle Society and in the Crestwood report. It preserves the character of the entrance into Dorridge and, without it, that character will be lost as will the current separation between Grove Road and Dorridge. With the proposed arden triangle development Dorridge and Knowle will blur into one and lose their distinctiveness and character.
Q35	Mr K R Baker [2041]		The overall situation (housing issues) has been prejudiced by the policy to categorise smaller settlements as 'washed over green belt'. Washed over green belt imposes unnecessary development restrictions that disallow these settlements being fully inclusive in places where movers and new entrants would prefer to live. The quality of this surrounding green belt land is generally poor from an agricultural standpoint and has limited economic benefit.
Q35	Mr M Trentham [2114]		I disagree with para 380 that "settlements.... contribute to the openness of the Green Belt". It may be that the layout of a settlement precludes the establishment of a logical boundary around it, and that may be a reason for maintaining washed-over status. Otherwise settlements should not be washed over. Infilling could result over time in the sensible removal of the settlement from the washed-over area as proposed by the Council for those areas in para 378. This is also the case described in Q36 below.
Q35	Mr Martin Archer [3315]		I agree that washed over status for Grove Road should remain.
Q35	Mr Steve Coathup [6078]		Grove Road in particular represents a transitional thoroughfare between rural and urban environments which greatly add to the amenity and appeal of KDBH. To remove washover status would represent a threat of substantial development and the loss of this asset.
Q35	Mrs Katie Wilson [5233]		Support for Site 18: Green belt should remain otherwise all areas will merge into one toy town of tiny new builds on top of each other with small gardens and a drive out to nearest green rural area. There would be no space or character.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q35	Mrs Helen Baker [5930]		I agree that the dwellings in Grove Road should remain a "washed over" Green Belt and that the land to the north between Grove Road and Knowle centre should be retained as Green Belt to provide a clear boundary to the existing residential area of the village.
Q35	Mrs Jill Hillman [5492]		I agree that the dwellings in Grove Road should remain a "washed over" Green Belt and that the land to the north between Grove Road and Knowle centre should be retained as Green Belt to provide a clear boundary to the existing residential area of the village. The Green Belt should not be built on as it should be kept as the small area of land that makes up the settlement of the villages of Knowle & Dorridge. Leave the Green Belt to do the job that it was set out to do - protect and enhance the area.
Q35	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		No - so long as the conditions referred to in the response to question 34 are sustained - namely the justification by reference to exceptional circumstances. A failure to demonstrate exceptional circumstances renders the Plan susceptible to legal challenge and thus ineffective, which in turn renders the plan unsound.
Q35	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		The settlements of Barston, Bickenhill and Berkswell should remain as washed over Green Belt if there is no proposal to release land for housing. The settlement of Chadwick End which has a distinct north and south parts should be taken out of the Green Belt and a settlement boundary should be drawn around it recognise the extent of opportunities for potential infilling development and safeguard the intervening land between the two parts.
Q35	Richard Lloyd [2616]		yes - retain status
Q35	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The washed over status of the settlements should remain
Q35	Simon Taylor [4550]		Yes, they should remain
Q35	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Agree remain
Q35	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The washed over status of the settlements should remain.
Q35	Terry Corns [4446]		I agree that the dwellings in Grove Road should remain a "washed over" Green Belt and that the land to the north between Grove Road and Knowle centre should be retained as Green Belt to provide a clear boundary to the existing residential area of the village.
Q35	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		The washed over Green Belt status of Barston, Chadwick End, Berkswell and Bickenhill should be determined in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 139).

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q35	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The washed over status of the settlements should remain
Q35	Wendy Cairns [4226]		Berkswell Parish is right in the Meriden Gap and is being attacked by building on the border with Coventry and Warwickshire any loss of the protection to Berkswell Village and the smaller settlements in the parish in this washer over area would result in the final dissemination of the Meriden Gap. It is time SMBC recognised the strategic importance of this area ans its duty to guard against its erosion.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Green Belt			
Q36	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		This section has not been delivered in an appropriate manner to elicit valuable contributions. The wording is confusing, and I expect there will be fewer responses, though with greater inconsistency. If so, this will raise questions over the contribution that responses to this section make to the consultation. This can be addressed, in future, with an explanation that would adhere to the Crystal Mark standard of Plain English. Mapping alongside the questions is a simple addition that would elicit clearer and more indicative responses
Q36	Dr Lucy Hillman [6184]		The washed over green belt status should remain for land either side of Grive road in Knowle, both the Arden triangle and the land behind extending down to blue lake. This helps to retain the boundary and does provide an open character and makes an addition to the openness of the green belt in Knowle and makes a clear boundary from the village and the green belt. Just because a developer or land owner wants to sell it for development does NOT make it less valuable green belt for the community. This land should be protected not developed.
Q36	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	See responses to omission sites where Green Belt status should be removed and sites removed from the Green Belt
Q36	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Whilst our Client supports the removal of the washed over Green Belt status of the land east of Solihull both north and south of Hampton Lane, including all land in his ownership, he firmly believes that the sites should be allocated for development and removed from the Green Belt even if the settlement boundary is not adjusted elsewhere. This is because the site meets all the national and local site selection criteria, details of which are highlighted within this letter.
Q36	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	- The washed over status should be reviewed in relation to the large area of existing development at Warwick Road, Pool Meadow Close and Riverside Drive. (This relates back to the Green Belt Assessment undertaken by Atkins in 2016 and <u>specifically Refined</u>
Q36	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Green Belt status of Site 136 - Oak Farms, Catherin-de-Barnes should be removed and site removed from the Green Belt.
Q36	Mr & Mrs Williams [6253]	Oakwood Planning Ltd (Mrs Jayne Cashmore) [5447]	The Council's approach is overly restrictive compared to the NPPF. The NPPF allows for limited infilling in villages and this should be the case throughout the Borough when housing is to be delivered and reliant on Green Belt sites. This is even more so the case if the Council intends not to allocate any Small Sites (see Q39 comment)

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q36	Mr J Allen [4072]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Paul Harris) [4070]	Washed over status should be reviewed on land at the northern end of Knowle, Copt Heath much of which is comprehensively developed, has no open character and serves no logical purpose as Green Belt land. Specifically, the land to south of Grove Farm (Site 5) along with the houses which front Jacobean Lane and Warwick Road. Generalised methodology of the Green Belt assessment means that all sites within a refined parcel are effectively 'tarred with the same brush.' Smaller parcels within them which may not possess the characteristics which are most prevalent within the wider parcel, are effectively scored incorrectly.
Q36	Mr M Trentham [2114]		YES The area which I refer to as the 'Oldway Drive Area' of concentrated residential development comprising Riverside Drive, Oldway Drive, Poolmeadow Close, Gentleshaw Lane, and Warwick Road. In all this contains just short of 200 dwellings, none of which is Affordable, and they do not contribute in any way to the openness of the Green Belt.
Q36	Mr Stephen Deehan [5931]		Site should be removed from the Green Belt.
Q36	Mrs Kealie Ahmad [6155]		No transparency why these sites have been lumped together and it has been decided they are not of rural or open nature, and there is no comparison as to why other sites have not been lumped together because collectively if permission were granted they too would then not be rural. For example sites 123, 44,45,48,168,173,334 when taken together would then have the same benefits of those proposed. These sites have also been assessed wrongly and inconsistently when compared with each other, for example, 2 sites 100 yards apart have been assessed as very high and low wrt food availability.
Q36	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		Any review of other areas of the Borough washed over by Green Belt should be undertaken in accordance with 2019 NPPF (para 139).
Q36	Simon Taylor [4550]		#NAME?
Q36	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	See responses to omission sites where Green Belt status should be removed and sites removed from the Green Belt

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q36	Summix (FHS) Developments Ltd [4455]	Framptons Planning (Mr Greg Mitchell) [2685]	<p>Concern over the way Fulford Hall Farm has been assessed within the site assessment report in relation to its contribution to the green belt and visual sensitivity. Significant errors in site assessment for Site 313. Step 1 should be priority 6 as accessibility high and moderately performing in Green Belt Assessment. Step 2 important judgements on green belt/landscape not based on robust evidence.</p> <p>Assigning Broad Areas score of 3 for Purpose 3 in GBA is flawed/unsound and artificially inflates score. Evidence provided demonstrates site has limited impact on Purpose 3 and would not undermine remaining green belt.</p> <p>Methodology to establish visual sensitivity in LCA muddled/poorly justified with no explanation how classification criteria assessed/judged. High classification based on ancient woodland not evident within site, whilst sub-urban influences in/around settlement ignored. Detailed robust evidence provided to show site well-contained, capable of accommodating development with limited visual impacts.</p>
Q36	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		Any review of other areas of the Borough washed over by Green Belt should be undertaken in accordance with 2019 NPPF (para 139).
Q36	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>The land to the North of Jacobean Lane (including sites 68 and 324) should be removed from the Green Belt and the Green Belt boundary amended.</p> <p>Properties on both sides of the Lane are distinctly similar and form part of the main fabric of Knowle. Properties to the north of Jacobean Lane are not isolated from the village or sporadic in nature. There is a distinct change of character between built development and open space/countryside which would be the more logical break between Green Belt and non-Green Belt and the edge of the village inset area.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Green Belt			
Q37	Akamba Heritage Centre (Mr Chris Canaan) [5539]		Impact on the function of high performing Green Belt status of land will be lost which is contrary to Government Policy; there would be coalescence between Dickens Heath, Whitlock End, Majors Green and Bromsgrove District.
Q37	Alison Robbins [4062]		Loss of access from South Shirley to Green Belt. Many people use this space to walk to be healthy or take the dog for a walk - me and my family are included in that. Items to be considered for South Shirley area are as follows:- Allocation 13 changed from public open space status to nature reserve. Improvements to public transport.
Q37	Andy Wilson [3394]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest green belt gap yet
Q37	Barry Jackson [3957]		I feel we need to have compensation to protect Site 13 as a nature reserve.
Q37	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		Concerned about loss of easy access to countryside from east Balsall Common currently provided by network of footpaths on Barratt's Farm, which is not possible to mitigate. Suggest creation of circular walks from Truggist Lane with improvements to difficult sections, replacement of stiles and footway linking to Station Road, designation of new circular walks east of Balsall Common, and provision of cycleway/footpath on Lavender Hall Lane linking Balsall Common and Berkswell. Footpath M196 could be extended full length of woods northwards from Railway Inn to junction of Lavender Hall Lane/Hall Meadow Road.
Q37	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		There is a network of footpaths on and around Barratt's Farm which are well used by dog-walkers and walking groups alike. At present these are easily accessed by all residents of Balsall Common and from groups from further afield. It is difficult to see how compensation for these could be achieved, especially with the constraints of HS2 and a possible by-pass and threat of a major road linking A46 and A45
Q37	Bill Young [6058]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest green belt gap. The Meriden gap should be protected as pledged by the Major and the Leader of the Council
Q37	Catherine Langton [3384]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest green belt gap yet.
Q37	Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]		Hampton in Arden and Catherine de Barnes. Plan should recognise the multiple threats posed against the Meriden Gap by HS2, M42 Junction 6 and MSA, which could increase pressure for further development and result in loss of gap between urban area and Catherine de Barnes.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	CGA Taylor [4250]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q37	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Improved access and protection for high usage areas of Green Belt. Country park at former Site 13, with separate consultation and bidding process with prioritisation for offsite mitigations. Essential that significant compensation is directed to Shirley and Blythe as have been hit particularly hard by the Local Plan.
Q37	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	Countryside Planning Services Limited (Chris Stratton) [5826]	Care and attention to detail must be applied for revised Green Belt boundaries, whether this relates to 'inset' boundaries around existing settlements or removing 'washed-over' settlements. Given the proposed release of tracts of Green Belt land for HS2 and around settlements, such as Balsall Common, representations using those releases as precedent should be expected. It is difficult to see how a compensatory provision can be created to mitigate the loss of land from the Green Belt, given the Green Belt objectives. Compensatory provisions for the loss of landscape and open areas should not be confused with Green Belt issues.
Q37	Cov, Warks, Solihull Local Access Forum (Alistair Rigby) [6099]		Loss of well used footpath network around Barratt's Farm giving easy access to the countryside from Balsall Common East away from busy roads eg Truggist Lane, Waste Lane, Lavender Hall Lane Is concerned about the loss of easy access to the countryside provided by the network of footpaths on Barratt's Farm. These footpaths form one of the most used footpath networks in the Borough forming a circular walk of between 2 and 4 miles which is ideal for walking, running and amenity enjoyment of the countryside. The footpaths are easily accessed from Balsall Common East of A452 and are popular with large numbers of regular walkers who have easy access via the paths from quiet residential roads with little traffic. I hope that this ease of access to the countryside for residents of all ages will remain and not be complicated or made impossible by having to walk on main roads without pavements such as Truggist Lane (with its dangerous commercial HGV traffic) Waste Lane and Lavender Hall Lane which are both blighted by fast
Q37	David Langton [3382]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest green belt gap yet.
Q37	Diane Langton [3380]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest green belt gap yet.
Q37	Edward Fraser [4138]		- Seek compensation to improve what will be left of Site 13 to help develop it further as a true nature reserve.
Q37	Eileen Lamb [5709]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q37	Gemma Welch [4413]		We need compensation to protect area that was known as Site 13 as a nature reserve and for use by the community.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	SMBC has demonstrated exceptional circumstances exist for some land to be released from the Green Belt to accommodate the Borough's own needs and a contribution to the unmet needs arising from the wider HMA as it is clear that the need cannot be accommodated simply by increasing densities and directing development towards non-Green Belt land.
Q37	Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]		Hampton in Arden and Catherine de Barnes. Plan should recognise the multiple threats posed against the Meriden Gap by HS2, M42 Junction 6 and MSA, which could increase pressure for further development and result in loss of gap between urban area and Catherine de Barnes.
Q37	Hannelore Lloyd [6260]		the proposed plan involves the release of a vast area of green belt which would be a great loss to the amenity of the area and would lead to urban sprawl by eroding the Meriden Gap between Balsall Common/Berkswell and Coventry.
Q37	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	Heyford Developments agree with the need for Green Belt enhancements, as encouraged by paragraph 138 of the NPPF, and particularly the creation of recreational areas where land is laid out to provide access to open areas, as suggested by the Council is paragraph 386 of the Consultation document. Highlight ability of land at Blue Lake Road to deliver such mitigation measures in the form of a new country park proposed for the eastern part of the site. Park approximately 4 Ha in size, provide for a range of recreational uses, and is proposed to be permanently available for public use.
Q37	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	Red site: 5 land at Grove House, Jacobean Lane The concept masterplans (Appendix 3) for the Site show compensatory planting to enhance the canal as well as area large areas of Public Open Space.
Q37	IM Land [3900]	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs Rachel Best) [2448]	Should provide benefit to compensate for loss of openness and be provision over and above that required for development, in the area of the loss. Could include on and off-site enhancements and needs element of control such as ownership. In case of Land North of Main Road Meriden, extensive green infrastructure; public open space, recreation areas, play space, attenuation areas, community garden and parkland would improve environmental quality with element of public access for existing and new residents. Would support access to green belt/countryside to east and improvements to existing right of ways. Further tree/hedgerow planting could be achieved.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Fiona Lee-McQueen) [6265]	In ref. to NPPF Para. 138, it is considered that any compensatory provision should be a qualitative provision, such as improved access, rather than a quantitative approach where more land for Green Belt is provided.
Q37	IM Properties [279]	Marrons Planning (Daniel Robinson-Wells) [6202]	Site 62 Stratford Road. Compensation would result from improvements to Shirley Golf Club and the environmental quality and accessibility of the golf course.
Q37	Ivan Lewis [5945]		Regarding the possibility of Solihull Council changing the status of green belt land on Widney Manor Road I would like to register my strongest objection. Concern that residents have not been consulted and would like to be kept informed of next stage of process.
Q37	Jean Fleming [3444]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest green belt gap yet.
Q37	Jennifer Archer [4016]		I would welcome Site 13 to be included as a compensatory provision, and for the area to be protected in perpetuity. Site 13 could be established as a nature reserve. It has been enjoyed by local residents without restriction for in excess of 40 years. This freedom of access should be maintained and enhanced for future generations
Q37	Joanna Johnson [5985]		We need compensation to protect Site 13 as a nature reserve
Q37	Joanne Liddiard- McGann [3407]		We need compensation to protect Site 13 as a nature reserve
Q37	Joelle Hill [4425]		I would like to see the area formerly known as Allocation 13 become ring-fenced and protected from any future development. This site already has the potential to be enhanced from an ecological and bio-diversity perspective and could be viewed as an offset for other areas of lower value green belt that might be given up for development in the Blythe area.
Q37	Kate Riemer [5550]		With reference to the wider Barratt's Farm site : Site 169 Blessed Robert Griswold Site, the Recreation Ground off Meeting House Lane, a long established and valuable recreational space, must be designated as a Local Green Space (as detailed in the Berkswell Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan) in addition to any compensatory provision planned for the Barratt's Farm site
Q37	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	- Compensatory measures should be framed around the provisions of paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework. - Sites being removed from the Green Belt should incorporate compensatory provision as part of the master planning approach (ie. S
Q37	Mark Taft [3595]		The area 13 between Shirley, Dickens heath and Cheswick green should be made public open space and nature reserve with cycle tracks and paths for the residents to enjoy.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	Mel Starling [4325]		Can the loss of so much greenbelt be justified The canal will become the green belt boundary (site 8). Previous applications failed on this issue. how much green belt will be lost to car parking in Knowle
Q37	Miss Susan Hillitt [5660]		What possible compensation will make up for loss of the very small amount of Green Belt the residents of Shirley still have?
Q37	Mr Alex Lukeman [3387]		Former Site 13 (land south of Shirley between Whitlock's End Farm and Dickens Heath Road). This site has been removed from potential development but its future requires protection for the continued enjoyment of residents. In view of its sensitivity, ancient trees, hedgerows, ecology, and ancient historical interest this needs to be developed as a nature reserve. It is well used and should be protected for future generations as recommended in the National Planning Policy Framework as offsetting to mitigate loss of greenbelt. Concerns are that this site may be affected by wash over from Site 26 unless protection is afforded.
Q37	Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest green belt gap yet so, as residents, we do not understand why the site is being included.
Q37	Mr Andrew Darby [5992]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet
Q37	Mr Bruce Richard [5691]		Do not see how there could be compensatory provision for loss of Green Belt at Widney Manor Road.
Q37	Mr Darren Douglas [5276]		We do not see how the land at Widney Manor Road could provide any compensation provision, given its shape and size. As openness is the most important attribute of the Green Belt, the loss of openness in this case would result in serious harm and would conflict with Policy C2 of the Solihull Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006, which deals with control of development in the Green Belt'
Q37	Mr David Patterson [5526]		Do not see how there could be compensatory provision for loss of Green Belt at Widney Manor Road.
Q37	Mr Derrick Walker [4780]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Mr Eric Homer [3721]		I applaud the removal of Site 13 from the plan and this area should now be made into a formal public open space or even designated as a nature reserve due to it being an area of biodiversity and habitat of value, an important area for local wildlife in Shirley. The development of sites 4, 11, 12 & 26 is contrary to the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy. Sites 11 & 12 are the least controversial sites. If this land is removed from the green belt then compensatory provision should be made by protecting sites 13 and 26.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		We need green belt compensation for all sites especially 13 and 26
Q37	Mr G Wilkinson [4788]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Mr Graham Cockroft [5780]		Public open space is scarce around Cheswick Green. Safe accessible open space would be welcome if land and funding were available, though this need does not outweigh objections to development in the green belt and/or the loss of agricultural land.
Q37	Mr Harry Siggs [2970]		Lost land cannot be replaced. The green belt should be protected. There is no need for compensation, just rigorous observation of green belt rules
Q37	Mr J Davies [2104]		Any development that reduces the amenity aspects of green belt to surrounding populations should be completed as discreetly and unobtrusively as possible. Footpaths, access means and maintenance of such should be a priority
Q37	Mr John Gibbs [5865]		Green belt areas were designated in order to prevent development on protected areas of open countryside, which are vital for the quality of our living environment. If development of green belt areas ride roughshod over this protection, then any compensation should be to grant even greater protection for remaining green spaces. An example of this could be to designate the previous proposed Site 13 as a nature reserve.
Q37	Mr John Wilson [3890]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Mr Jon Sellars [5962]		GREEN BELT MUST BE PROTECTED AT ALL COSTS!!! Why are you insisting on destroying green belt land - this must be protected. When it is gone - it is gone forever! What provisions are you making to replace any that you are destroying?
Q37	Mr K Hazelwood [6239]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Mr K Millican [4779]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Mr Neil Jeffries [5728]		Site 13 should be protected as a nature reserve.
Q37	Mr P Phillips [4798]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Mr Phillip Griffiths [5939]		Re: Widney Manor Road - Not clear if the land proposed to be removed is just site 134 or sites 205 and 308 too. - Do not see how the land at Widney Manor Road could provide any compensation provision given its shape and size
Q37	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		Improvements to remaining footpaths. In particular for Balsall Common an all weather route from the Greenway to Berkswell Village to include a safe access over the West Coast mainline at Lavender Hall bridge. Access to allow residents who currently use Barretts Farm to reach the footpaths beyond the West Coast Mainline and HS2 safely

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
			Please see attached letter
Q37	Mr Robin Easterby [5943]		(Letter not attached on JDi. Email sent 09.05.19 to respondent, Robin Easterby via PSP email address. Email reply on 09.05.19 stating that he was unable to resend letter but..."I suspect you may already have seen similar contents from other objecting residents on Widney Manor Road as it was a standard letter recommended by the Widney Manor Action Group. Basically I object to the proposed development as it would fundamentally change the nature of the area, is green belt, and is an example of garden grabbing at its worst. The traffic along Widney Manor Road has dramatically increased since I moved into 136 and the proposal will only make matters worse.")
Q37	Mr S C Howles [6237]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Mr Stephen Harvell [6159]		We need compensation to protect site 13 as a nature reserve.
Q37	Mr Steven Webb [2960]		Site 16 has a very thin Coppice planted around 1990 between the rear of Pinfold Road houses, it would be nice to extend this, make it wider and extend it so that it around the side of the final house at the end of the road and between the orchard field and the end of the road. This would offer more separation between the existing properties and the fields, it would increase the wildlife corridor and would offer more line of sight protection between existing housing and new properties.
Q37	Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]		Site 13 should be given long-term protection (Nature reserve or similar) to retain for future generations. Given also it now has documented historical evidence dating to 800 AD. A copy of this document is filed with the Warwickshire Historic environment office.
Q37	Mr Trevor Vaisey [5661]		Site 13 should be protected as a nature reserve and compensation made available for this purpose
Q37	Mr William Cairns [3206]		Green Belt Enhancements - we agree with the provisions in the NPPF but the Greenway is presently being decimated by HS2 work and although will be reinstated cannot be returned to its former glory. The link to the station is meaningless it will be a footpath to the car park, linking to what green belt?
Q37	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Supports the decision to review Green Belt boundaries to accommodate the identified growth.
Q37	Mrs Katie Wilson [5233]		- If green belt is gone & high density developments in their place a compensation as described would not make up at all for the space to be built on. - Wider issue is schools, roads all of which are wholly inadequate for the area as it is. - Each new h
Q37	Mrs A Hazelwood [6240]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	Mrs A Kidson [6259]		The gap between Shirley and Dickens Heath will be narrow. There should be protection of the greenbelt.
Q37	Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]		In mitigation for the amount of houses, nearly 40% being built on 24% of available land, all land around site 13 as far as the canal should be given over to the community in compensation.
Q37	Mrs Brenda Clayson [5668]		Consider carefully the benefit of maintaining the Green Belt and enhancing its viability for people and nature. Solihull will not longer be able to claim 'town in the country' otherwise, but another sprawling jungle. We need: Off road cycle paths, allocation 13 changed to a nature reserve, improved public transport, park and ride, utilising parking at Earlswood Station, maintain and enhance sporting and recreational facilities.
Q37	Mrs Carla Meyer Davies [4451]		As a supporter of the removal of Site 13 from the draft plan, we as residents would like reassurance that this land stays out of danger. We as a community would like to see this site be protected as a nature reserve so that it can continue to be enjoyed by the community without the threat of the bulldozers moving in.
Q37	Mrs Carol Clarke [5822]		Site 13 should be made a nature reserve or similar to ensure it protected this could include the christmas tree field next to footpath to mitigate for site 26
Q37	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		Improvements to all remaining footpaths in and around Balsall Common. Safe access from Barretts Farm across the West Coast mainline and HS2. Improved/safe non-vehicle access from Balsall Common to Berkswell
Q37	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		Relocating is not feasible if you take Green Belt and existing wildlife corridors between open spaces away. It is therefore essential that existing sites eg. Site 13 in Shirley should be protected as a nature reserve. The Site 26 is also important as a link for the movement of wildlife from Site 13 as they are interlinked. If the land is lost to us for recreation and fitness then it will also be lost for the wild life.
Q37	Mrs Clare Heath [5871]		Widney Manor Road could not provide any compensation for loss of green belt, given its shape and size.
Q37	Mrs Diane Thornton [3107]		However with the development at Site 26, then the former site 13 land must be the mitigation against the loss of green belt and it would be beneficial for the community if this was designated a Village Green/ Nature Reserve.
Q37	Mrs Elspeth Hamilton [5052]		Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements.
Q37	Mrs Gillian Tomkys [4787]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Mrs J A Howles [6236]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		A country park should be created on the site of the former allocation 13 S. Shirley as mitigation for loss of Green Belt in the Blythe area.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	Mrs Johanna Sahi-Proto [5391]		Please see attached letter.
Q37	Mrs Julia Finnegan [5742]		Compensation to protect site 13 as a nature reserve is required
Q37	Mrs Katrina Jamieson [5817]		No more building on Widney Manor road between the station and the 6th form college.
Q37	Mrs Linda Homer [3729]		<p>I applaud the removal of site 13 from the plan and this area should now be made into a formal public open space or even designated as a nature reserve due to it being an area of biodiversity and habitat of value, an important area for local wildlife in Shirley.</p> <p>The development of sites 4, 11, 12 & 26 is contrary to the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy.</p> <p>Sites 11 & 12 are the least controversial sites. If this land is removed from the green belt then compensatory provision should be made by protecting sites 13 and 26.</p>
Q37	Mrs Lisa Mitchell [5498]		Do not see how there could be compensatory provision for loss of Green Belt at Widney Manor Road.
Q37	Mrs Lisa Mitchell [5498]		Please see attached letter
Q37	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		<p>Why not start from a position where any current Green Belt site over say 2ha. being proposed for development or concept masterplanning should allocate 50% to be retained as open landscape and other acceptable Green Belt functions.</p> <p>For instance on Site 9 the Masterplan shows an LWS which is only presently restricted to land with serious development constraints but this could be easily added to by the addition of further permanently accessible 'common' type use to retain amenity and encourage public use.</p>
Q37	Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]		Site 13 has been removed from the draft local plan. But Solihull council still want to put nearly 40% of all new home (not including the hundreds of retirement properties) in a small already overdeveloped area of Solihull taking away most of our greenbelt. Compensatory fields adjacent to site 13 should be given as public open space in mitigation for the proposed overdevelopment of this area.
Q37	Mrs Pamela Robertson [5736]		The land at the rear of the gardens of 114-118 Widney Manor Road has already been affected as it has already been partially cleared, drastically affecting the habitats of local wildlife. The release of this site would have further detrimental impact on green belt functions and openness.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	Mrs Ruth Wolinski [5727]		We object to the the removal of the Green Belt status of Widney Manor Road and in particular object strongly to any development to the rear of 114-118 Widney Manor Road. We do not see how the land to the rear of 114-118 could provide any compensation provision, given its shape and size.
Q37	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		Compensation is required to protect Site 13 as a nature reserve, It is already under threat with being surrounded and enclosed on 3 sides. The combination of expanding site 11, Site 12 and the new Site 26 put immense pressure on infrastructure and will make our air pollution even worse. There are significant reductions in Green Belt Land throughout Shirley changing forever the environment.
Q37	Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]		Allocation 13 has been removed from the draft local plan, I believe that adjacent fields to this site should in mitigation for all the the local proposed building be made open to the public and turned into a nature reserve.
Q37	Mrs Wendy Murphy [5694]		Compensation to protect site 13 as a nature reserve.
Q37	Ms Barbara Connah [5693]		We need compensation to protect Site 13 as a nature reserve.
Q37	Ms Rebecca Hess [5754]		Previous Inspections have concluded that the harm caused by removing the area around Widney Manor Road from the Green Belt would not be outweighed by the provision of limited housing on this site, whatever its purpose. Over intensification of development in mature suburbs is short sighted and creates another raft of issues. No exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The garden grab initiatives that would result would be based on individual profit, rather than thoughtful and responsible planning that should benefit Solihull in future years.
Q37	Nic Heath [5576]		Do not see how there could be compensatory provision for loss of Green Belt at Widney Manor Road.
Q37	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		Recommendation: where a specific site is adjacent to a site of Special Scientific interest a Section 106 agreement should be negotiated with the developer to improve access to SSSI e.g Grand Union Canal from Catherine de Barnes to Damson Parkway adjacent to Site 16 East of Solihull. The same recommendation could apply to the protection of Heritage Sites and their setting e.g. Grimshaw Hall (Site 8 Hampton Lane, Knowle) and Field Farm and 237 Lugtrout Lane (Site 16 East of Solihull). Views of heritage assets and SSSI's from surrounding land should be taken into account.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	Paul J Dufrane [4410]		- If site 13 is the mitigation against the loss of green belt for sites south of Shirley, then would be beneficial for the community if this was designated a Village Green/ Nature Reserve.
Q37	Pauline Daniels [3674]		We need compensation to protect site 13 as a nature reserve.
Q37	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		Any compensatory provision made for land removed from the Green Belt should be determined in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 137).
Q37	Peter & Elaine King [3262]		Any Green Belt land used should be compensated by provision of nature reserves as a lot of these areas will be lost and the wild life that we are so used to seeing will be eradicated.
Q37	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Have set out how proposals at site - Land at Fulford Hall can respond to paragraph 138 of the NPPF: Improvements to Environmental Quality * Enhancement and strengthening of Green Infrastructure and wildlife corridors, e.g. hedgerows. * Net gain of trees, including planting new woodland to the north east of the site. * Management of ancient woodland. * Provision of public open space. Improvements to accessibility of the Green Belt * Improved access between Tidbury Green and the surrounding area to the east, including new footpath along Rumbush Lane. Reduction in walking time between village and the Cricket Club (i.e. through the site and along Rumbush Lane); and between the houses to the south east of Tidbury Green and the school and other facilities in the village. * Provision of open space comprising either informal play or playing field or natural area of play with potential to foster outdoor learning. * The potential to provide a further playing field adjacent to Dickens Heath Sports
Q37	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	The proposals will provide a direct link into the public right of way to the south.
Q37	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	The allocation (site allocation 21) has the potential to reinforce the urban edge as set out in the Solihull Borough Local Character Guide and to enhance Green Infrastructure and habitat corridors where possible. There are also opportunities to link into the existing public right of way to the north.
Q37	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	The proposals (for site reference 416) will provide opportunity to link into the wider movement network and nearby public rights of way to encourage accessibility beyond the village into the surrounding countryside

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Any proposals for our Client's site (Land South of Park Lane) will comprise a landscape-led masterplan and will enhance Green Infrastructure and linkages to the wider countryside.
Q37	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	The proposals will provide opportunity to link into the wider movement network and nearby public rights of way to encourage accessibility beyond the village into the surrounding countryside. As mentioned, we consider SHELAA Site 417 suitable for the provision of sports pitches. Provision of playing pitches to the north or west of the site would assist in the transition between the development and the countryside and would maximise the gap between the village and Blythe Valley and Cheswick Green.
Q37	Rebecca Clare [3956]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Country Parks should be created in the Green Belt. Country Park A should be formed on the site of the former allocation 13 South Shirley as mitigation for loss of Green Belt in the Blythe area. Country Park B should be created on the land between the Solihull Bypass and Ravenshaw Lane formed of the old Berry Hall Estate as mitigation for the loss of Green Belt around Solihull Country Park C should be created formed adjoining Balsall Common as mitigation
Q37	Richard Lloyd [2616]		The primary aim should be to improve public access, subject to recognition that much of the land would be working farmland. The current Solihull Rights of Way Improvement Plan 2016 sets out numerous opportunities for improvement that have not been funded. Improvements should facilitate use by all ages/abilities, with improved path surfaces. New walking/riding circular routes/enhancement of existing. Encourage registration of unrecorded access rights. Safe routes along/across roads for non-motorised users
Q37	Richborough Estates [3816]	Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]	15. The use of some parts of the Richborough Estates' land interests at Balsall Common, Cheswick Green and Dickens Heath would be available for biodiversity enhancements and the provision of accessible play areas would provide the opportunity sought by the Framework to improve environmental quality and provide access to this land.
Q37	Richborough Estates [3816]	Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]	In reference to SHELAA Site 99, west of Cheswick Green, Tanworth Lane: The use of some parts of the wider site for biodiversity enhancements and the provision of accessible play areas would provide the opportunity sought by the Framework to improve environmental quality and provide access to this land.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	Roderick Hatton [5809]		At Barratts Farm there should be large areas of public open space to compensate for loss of Green Belt
Q37	Sheila Cooper [2560]		Concerned about loss of easy access to the countryside provided by a network of footpaths on Barratt's Farm. Safe and easy access should be maintained and avoid main roads without pavements. SMBC could undertake mitigation projects under the guidance of those who use the footpath networks regularly. New footpaths, cycle ways and bridle paths could be created under expert guidance. Berkswell village would benefit from footpath provision, and access to countryside provides health benefit for all
Q37	Simon Taylor [4550]		As noted above, I do not believe certain area of land should be removed from Green Belt, but if they are then surrounding areas MUST be enhanced in terms of Green Belt status or to become Conservation Areas, so as to preserve the intrinsic character of settlements as per the Local Plan. Put simply, no further removal of Green Belt status should be allowed in the Blythe Area, to include all amber and red sites, as urban sprawl is a severe concern in this area (as highlighted by the allocation of sites map)
Q37	Simon Clare [3953]		The development of site 3 would create the narrowest gap yet.
Q37	Stephen Dunn [6275]	Sworders (Miss Michelle Hill) [6070]	Compensatory provision can be provided if site 110 was allocated. The area of land which has omitted from the site could provide access to open areas adjacent to Knowle Locks for recreational purposes and preserve and improve biodiversity along the canal corridor.
Q37	Susan Roberts [5924]		Re: Widney Manor Road - Not clear if the land proposed to be removed is just site 134 or sites 205 and 308 too. - Do not see how the land at Widney Manor Road could provide any compensation provision, given its shape and size.
Q37	Terry Clayson [4147]		Consider carefully the benefit of maintaining the Green Belt and enhancing its viability for people and nature. Solihull will not longer be able to claim 'town in the country' otherwise, but another sprawling jungle. We need: Off road cycle paths, allocation 13 changed to a nature reserve, improved public transport, park and ride, utilising parking at Earlswood Station, maintain and enhance sporting and recreational facilities.
Q37	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		Any compensatory provision made for land removed from the Green Belt should be determined in accordance with the 2019 NPPF (para 137).

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q37	The Ramblers, warwickshire Area (Mr Michael Bird) [3483]		Green Belt Enhancements: No possible enhancements would be able to compensate in the slightest for the extreme damage that taking Barretts Farm out of the Green Belt (with the resulting over-expansion of Balsall Common) will cause. As for 'an opportunity to link up with the Greenway', the rural setting of the Greenway will become permanently destroyed by being trapped between HS2 and the A46/A452 Link Road - a valuable green asset reduced to a mere urban cycle track!
Q37	Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss Charlotte Kirby) [2531]		South of Shirley A country park should be created as open and accessible space south of Woodloes Road as part of the Green Belt compensation enhancements with access improvements and habitat creation.
Q37	Wendy Cairns [4226]		With so much green belt being savaged by Solihull compensatory development is essential

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Omitted Sites			
Q38	Aaron White [5878]		<p>Site A4 - GOLDEN END FARM Site should NOT be considered for further development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High scoring green belt land. - Area (Kixley Lane) constantly in use by local people for leisure purposes. <p>Development would impact upon this to detriment of health.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cannot cope with traffic increase - junction of Warwick/Kenilworth Roads cannot cope with current traffic flow. Parking here is crucial to local businesses. - Knowle does not have infrastructure to cope with extra development. <p>Dorridge/Bentley Heath and other areas of Solihull have more capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development would increase pollutants near to a school contrary to Government's health agenda.
Q38	Alexander Rooney [6278]		<p>Golden End Farm: Ref A4 / site 59.</p> <p>Object strongly to possible allocation for housing as will increase pressure on local services, traffic and parking. Site is within highly performing green belt and should not be developed in preference to lower scoring parcels elsewhere in Knowle/Dorridge, eg south-west of Dorridge and north-west of Bentley Heath.</p>
Q38	Amber REI Ltd [6250]	Pegasus Group (David Onions) [6248]	<p>Site A5 - Land off Blue Lane Road</p> <p>The site performs an important Green Belt function in checking the unrestricted sprawl of a large built up areas and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>The site should score 9, which would put it firmly in the Red category, which recognises the potential for severe and widespread impacts that would result from development of the site.</p> <p>Significant impacts from the need to provide for suitable access which would compound harm to this sensitive site. Access would be difficult given the nature of surrounding roads and impact on the character of the area.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Andrew Hodge [3103]		Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (A5) Support exclusion. The Arden triangle and Hampton Road sites already add circa 900 dwellings to Knowle & Dorridge, village environments never designed to deal with this capacity (schools, doctors, roads, parking). Specifically, land off Blue Lake Road already suffers with flooding. Grove Road, Blue Lake Road and Norton Green Road are all narrow without footpaths making them hazardous to pedestrians and traffic. The area has been heralded nationally as desirable, attracting wealth creators, bringing greater prosperity to the area. Further development would destroy one of the last desirable village locations in the Borough.
Q38	Arden Multi Academy Trust (mr Mark Wilson) [5910]		Rowood Drive (ref A6)We consider that the Amber designation of Rowood Drive site is unjustified. We consider that there is a compelling case for the site to be included in the Local Plan Review as an allocation for residential development. This is a crucial first step in Lode Heath School's efforts to realise income from the sale of the site for housing to fund the development of an enhanced Community Sports Facility that would bring significant benefits both to the school and the wider local community. I have attached responses that have been sent to me at Lode Heath school
Q38	Arden Multi Academy Trust (mr Mark Wilson) [5910]		Rowood Drive(ref A6 We consider that the Amber designation of Rowood Drive site is unjustified. We consider that there is a compelling case for the site to be included in the Local Plan Review as an allocation for residential development. This is a crucial first step in Lode Heath School's efforts to realise income from the sale of the site for housing to fund the development of an enhanced Community Sports Facility that would bring significant benefits both to the school and the wider local community. I have attached responses that have been sent to me at Lode Heath school
Q38	Arden Multi Academy Trust (mr Mark Wilson) [5910]		Rowood Drive(ref A6) We consider that the Amber designation of Rowood Drive site is unjustified. We consider that there is a compelling case for the site to be included in the Local Plan Review as an allocation for residential development. This is a crucial first step in Lode Heath School's efforts to realise income from the sale of the site for housing to fund the development of an enhanced Community Sports Facility that would bring significant benefits both to the school and the wider local community. I have attached responses that have been sent to me at Lode Heath school

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Arden Multi Academy Trust (mr Mark Wilson) [5910]		We consider that the Amber designation of Rowood Drive site is unjustified. We consider that there is a compelling case for the site to be included in the Local Plan Review as an allocation for residential development. This is a crucial first step in Lode Heath School's efforts to realise income from the sale of the site for housing to fund the development of an enhanced Community Sports Facility that would bring significant benefits both to the school and the wider local community. I have attached responses that have been sent to me at Lode Heath school
Q38	Barry Jackson [3957]		I feel that that the land off Blue Lake Road (Ref A5) must be a better option than the sites in Blythe. There is capacity for more houses and the infrastructure is more able to cope.
Q38	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Site 345 575A-601 Tanworth Lane, Cheswick Green (A1) should be assessed as green and allocated. Opportunity to infill land within built up area, utilising brownfield land and garden land. Sustainable location, ideally located close to Cheswick Green village services, school and existing bus services, served by pavements. No significant constraints, logical infill, no impact of green belt. Meets criteria for green belt review SHELAA site assessment misleading, should be Category 1, no bad neighbour use or wildlife site, not backland development and only one dwelling requires demolition. Not included in Sustainability Appraisal. Object to inclusion as priority 5 in site selection, as proportion brownfield. Should be priority 3 for brownfield area and 5 for remainder as lower performing green belt. No constraints so Step 2 should be green.
Q38	Brian Henry Garman [5873]		Site A7 - Widney Manor Road No need to change the Green belt status of this relatively small area of land and leave it open to possible development. I strongly believe that the Planning Inspector's decision (Appeal Ref: App/Q4625/A/10/2133554) to dismiss the appeal in respect of an outline application for residential development on land r/114-118 Widney Manor Road and the reasons for it in 2011 still apply. The protection of Green Belt status should stand.
Q38	Cheswick Green Parish Council (Mrs M Zizzi) [2095]		A1 and A2 Cheswick Green - We do not agree with this approach. There is no need to change the Green Belt status of the area in order to deal with proposals to develop any of the sites.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Christopher Fellows [6118]		This Call for Sites reference 101: Old Waste Lane, Balsall Common has low accessibility, is in lower performing green belt, with the Sustainability Appraisal identifying 3 positive (1 significant), 8 neutral and 6 negative (2 significant) effects. Site is given priority 7, yet is rated amber with commentary indicating site could come forward if wider alterations are made to green belt boundaries. Commentary contains errors on Green Belt Assessment and SA scores.
Q38	Colin Davis [3352]		Amber site A4. Rowood Drive. This site would have to be sympathetically developed in a style of semi detached with decent front and rear gardens like damsonwood and lode lane. Too many developments in Solihull are cramped and over developed with apartments with high density like Wharf Lane that have no front space or driveways; these homes just generate parking issues for residents because of poor design.
Q38	Councillor J Tildesley [2119]		Reference A7 I was disappointed in the extreme to see that previously refused applications for a large site at Widney Manor Road has been re-introduced into this consultation.
Q38	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Whilst I recognise the need to use amber sites, I feel it vital that my responses are kept neutral. Residents most closely impacted by the sites, who have most intimate knowledge should be given primacy in the responses.
Q38	David Osborne [5891]		Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (ref A5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strongly object. - A5 is high quality green belt. - Contravenes policy D1 'Density'. - Detrimental to 'local character' required by the National Planning Policy forum. - Visual Sensitivity is extremely high due to the openness of this location. This location is on a hill so any development will be obvious to immediate area and beyond. - Flooding risk. - Ruins the visual approach to Dorridge. - With the profile of Dorridge and this location, the development would impact the overall attractiveness of Solihull Borough. - Site 207 makes far more sense, closer to M42 and major road access and much lower visual impact.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	David Whiteley [5507]		Amber Site A7 - should NOT be considered for future development: 1.The land in question is a wildlife corridor that supports badgers, bats,foxes, muntjac deer etc. These animals are picked up regularly by our wildlife camera. 2. The road infrastructure cannot take the additional traffic congestion and access issues which would result, particularly the junction at Widney Lane/Widney Manor Road and railway station access. Accidents at this spot are a regular occurrence and there is not enough room to add a traffic island. 3. Additional light, noise and environmental pollution would add to the current incessant road and rail pollution.
Q38	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		we would support the further review of all the Amber Sites being included in principle - very positive on ref A3 Whitlock's End, some reservations at Cheswick Green where Flood risks would need careful assessment.
Q38	Dickens Heath Residents Association (Trevor Eames) [6245]		The Residents Association support the review and inclusion of all the Amber Sites as proposed
Q38	Dr Linda Parsons [3849]		They should all be omitted
Q38	Dr Elizabeth Venables [6178]		Ref A6 There are so few green areas left in solihull we do not need more houses taking up that precious land. The area on Rowood drive is used every day for dog walkers, children playing games, football matches. It's part of the local community and would be unjust to remove it to cram in more housing when there is already such little open space for us to enjoy in the local area
Q38	Dr Lucy Hillman [6184]		I especially object to ref A5 - land off Blue lake Rd. This is high quality green belt, farming and agricultural land currently and should remain so. Using high quality green belt land for development would surely ruin the very nature of the place and is unnecessary. There is plenty of land that sits between Knowle and Solihull that would be far less damaging to existing settlements if developed. There is absolutely no justification in turning high quality green belt land that defines the very nature of these settlements into high density developments. Much more appropriate land exists elsewhere. .
Q38	Dr Paul Rylah [5503]		Amber Sites A4 and A5 - My objection is influenced by the scale of proposed settlements for Knowle. plus as per previous comments, we should not be developing sites that will increase the volume of traffic through the village centre, an almost certain eventuality as most commutes will be nothing to solihull, Birmingham, the M42, HS2 stations and the airport. We need to be looking at developing near the M42, the Solihull Gap, which is amply able to absorb the obvious requirements for new housing, whilst still maintaining a "gap". Some developments in and around Knowle is fine, but the total needs scaling back.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Edward Fraser [4138]		The non-Shirley Area sites should not be included in the omitted sites, and thus remove the ridiculous burden on Shirley, Dickens Heath and Whitlocks End.
Q38	Gemma Welch [4413]		Too much focus on the development of Shirley and surrounds with other areas of the Solihull borough not being impacted upon.
Q38	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	There is no advantage in creating and labelling sites yellow, blue and subsequently amber. This merely creates an unnecessary stage in the methodology adding to confusion and unnecessary complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them. The sites would be commented on or not under omission sites in general.
Q38	Geoff Osborne [5991]		Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (ref A5) - Site 413 is unsuitable for such a large development. - Too dense and creating difficulties with parking and extra traffic. - No nearby public transport and strains on local doctors, schools etc - It would make far more sense to use Site 207 for traffic to access M42 Solihull town centre etc for easier circulation.
Q38	Geoffrey Hayward [5970]		Golden End Farm (ref A4) - Scale of this development is excessive for Knowle - Combined with sites 8 and 9, the number of dwellings for the three sites is c 1200. - Already busy streets would become more congested - Health risks associated with increased traffic particularly near local schools - Golden End Farm is a VERY HIGH scoring parcel of Green Belt, adjacent to Kenilworth Road and Kixley Lane Conservation areas - Infrastructure in Knowle is already working to capacity - This is not a NIMBY protest - a protest of logic and good sense.
Q38	Gill Corns [4448]		I particularly object to Ref A5 & Ref 413 being included. These sites are high quality Green Belt and must be retained as such. To include these sites is unnecessary and would be an inappropriate intrusion into quality Green Belt which benefits the whole of the Knowle & Dorridge community. If needed there are large areas of land suitable to be included in future residential development plans in the "gap" between Knowle and Solihull where the M42 already influences the open space.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Gillian Griggs [3964]		The NF objected to the scale of 1000+ houses in KDBH. As none of the matters raised in the 2016 objection have been satisfactorily addressed, a further 590 houses cannot be accommodated in the area without substantial harm to the character and appearance of the KDBH area, contrary to the aims of the Spatial Strategy and the Draft KDBH NP. Whether parts of these sites can be brought forward as alternatives to all or part of the draft allocations requires further consideration based on a clearer understanding of the site hierarchy assessments and site impacts/proposed mitigation.
Q38	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	<p>We submit that Amber Site ref A4, Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road, Knowle, should not be omitted and should be included in the Submission Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>This site immediately adjoins Knowle village to the east and offers a highly sustainable option to bring forward an exemplar housing development as outlined in the submitted Proposal Site Supporting Statement.</p> <p>As set out in the Site Supporting Statement, the site offers a highly sustainable growth opportunity. This is recognised in much of the evidence base documents which score it extremely well in terms of accessibility, suitability, availability and deliverability.</p> <p>See full representation.</p>
Q38	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	<p>Strongly object to omission of amber sites 104 and 413 as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The site compares favourably against draft allocated sites in Green Belt and accessibility terms, including Draft Allocation Site 8 (Hampton Road, Knowle), and has thus been incorrectly scored in the Site Selection Process * Concern is raised surrounding the overall number of houses generated from the draft allocations in meeting unmet need in HMA. For example, Site 9 is in multiple ownership and there is evidence that the capacity will not be achievable. * It is not demonstrated how 2000 dwellings for HMA shortfall will be delivered.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	James Cypher [5712]		<p>My objection to Ref A5 (Blue Lake Road) is based on the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Overly intensive development not in keeping with character and feel of village. This particular development site is proposed to be built on a key entry point to the village and as such negatively impacts the first impression of Dorridge from this approach. * Loss of amenity and open aspect for properties situated on the 4 roads in the immediate proximity * Impact of increased traffic to social wellbeing, environment and noise pollution. * Exacerbation of existing parking issues relating to the train station
Q38	JK & C Knaggs [5395]		<p>Amber A7 - We are concerned about the reclassification of the site, and we believe it is detrimental to our interests.</p> <p>It is only 3 years ago that the site was rejected by the council, after appeal, by the Inspector. The reasons for rejection are still valid therefore making it difficult to see any logic in the Council's decision to reclassify.</p> <p>It is our view that the site should be excluded from the plan and from future consideration.</p>
Q38	John & Bev Scott [6220]		<p>Ref A5 - Blue Lake Road</p> <p>Should not be removed from the green belt</p> <p>It is on the rural fringe and is far too visible</p> <p>From an amenity and landscape perspective it is far too valuable in preserving the nature and character of the village</p> <p>Any consideration for development would produce such low numbers of houses that it's contribution would not justify the damage to the traditional and established fabric.</p> <p>Blue Lake road is a route in to the countryside for many walkers and cyclists -which would be damaged</p>
Q38	Joy Foster [5766]		<p>Reference to A6 Rowood Drive</p> <p>Traffic already congested and dangerous in that area and positioning on the road near a bend and main road increases the risks and danger</p> <p>Loss of privacy from house that backs on to land and effect on house prices.</p> <p>Green belt land lost, loss of green space and wildlife.</p> <p>Pressure on facilities such as sewage etc and also local schools which are already oversubscribed.</p> <p>Disruption and noise to the local area during the building</p> <p>Make use of the area for the community purposes and develop the land for locals not further crammed in housing</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	- Sites to be taken forward, should be assessed against a PPG compliant assessment methodology, which has not been the case in the Council's site selection Framework. - The Council are deferring the issue of ensuring that there are enough housing allocations
Q38	Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]		In its 2016 DLP consultation response, the NF objected to the scale of 1000+ houses in KDBH. As none of the matters raised then have been satisfactorily addressed, the Forum cannot see how a further 590 houses can be accommodated in the Area without substantial harm to KDBH Area, contrary to the aims of the Spatial Strategy and the Draft KDBH NP. Whether parts of these sites can be brought forward as alternatives to all, or part, of the draft allocations would require further consideration based on a clearer understanding of the site hierarchy assessments and site impacts/proposed mitigation.
Q38	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	see detail in appendix 2 included in letter
Q38	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	Observations as to why one of the larger amber sites should not have been preferred before land at Grange Farm We consider that the Grange Farm site should have been, or should be, categorised as a Green site. At the very least it outperforms the Golden End Farm site and so should rank higher than this in the Council's assessment.
Q38	Laura Emma Johnson [5723]		Amber Site - A4 Golden End Farm Kixley Lane is the oldest road in Knowle with historical importance. Development would be detrimental to that. It holds great historical value when you appreciate the location of the church to its proximity to Kixley lane itself. From the canal you see a beautiful landscape on the edge of the village which would be lost if houses were built here. Wildlife has space to breed & it would be a terrible loss if this site were lost to development. Saddened by development in an area which is part of knowle's original heritage.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Lode Heath School [251]	Urban Vision Partnership Ltd (Mrs Janette Findley) [3046]	Site A6 Rowood Drive forms a part of Lode Heath school estate but is detached from the main campus. The Amber designation of the site is unjustified and it should be allocated for residential development, as accessible and suitable. The school wishes to realise income from the sale of the site for housing to fund the development of an enhanced Community Sports facility on the main campus, bringing significant benefits for both the school and the wider community. Loss of disused pitch to be compensated by improvements to school gymnasium and youth football and rugby pitches.
Q38	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	There is no advantage in creating and labelling sites yellow, blue and subsequently amber. This merely creates an unnecessary stage in the methodology adding to confusion and unnecessary complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them. The sites would be commented on or not under omission sites in general.
Q38	Miss Audrey Gooderham [5818]		I object to the proposed amber site of Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road, Knowle, ref A4, quite simply this area is of local importance, because you can walk out of Knowle Centre in 5 minutes and you can have your mental health restored by nature with the inclusion of the canal and farmland which has an overall score 11. Land can never be made again - so don't concrete over it in the first place.
Q38	Miss Elizabeth Brace [3102]		Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (A5) Support exclusion of LWS, the abandoned garden/orchard between Barn End, Grove Road and No.88 from the developer's proposals. This land, known as Site 109, provides habitat for owls, bats and badgers, and has several notable trees and hedges. Understand that the two fields behind Barn End, that border Norton Green Lane, have also been excluded from the proposals. This move has protected these existing habitats.
Q38	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Amber Site Reference 116; Land at and to the rear of 146-152 Tilehouse Lane, Whitlock's End.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Site 116 r/o 146-152 Tilehouse Lane, Whitlock's End (A3) should be assessed as green and allocated.</p> <p>Existing housing/railway line/road provide strong defensible green belt boundaries. NE and SW boundaries well treed.</p> <p>Sustainable location, near station and existing bus services, served by pavements. Close to nursery school/church/restaurant with further facilities nearby in Tidbury Green/Wythall/Grimes Hill/Major's Green/extended Dickens Heath.</p> <p>No significant constraints, site available and evidence provided. Planning Appeal demonstrates well-contained, openness issues can be addressed.</p> <p>SHELAA site assessment misleading, should be Category 1, and capacity unrealistic. Landscape Character Assessment irrelevant. Sustainability Appraisal performance contested.</p> <p>Object to inclusion as priority 8 in site selection, as medium accessibility and part brownfield. Should be priority 3 for brownfield area and 5 for remainder as lower performing green belt. No constraints so Step 2 should be green.</p>
Q38	Mr & Mrs James [5784]		<p>A4 - concern that Golden End Farm will be used for housing</p> <p>Would be bad for Knowle, which is a historical village</p> <p>Knowle would not be able to sustain that amount of people arriving - parking, schools, doctors are at full capacity</p> <p>Why not build on Brownfield sites around the area where services are adequate</p> <p>In Solihull there are 1000 empty homes, why not take advantage of those?</p> <p>We strongly object.</p>
Q38	Mr & Mrs Williams [6253]	Oakwood Planning Ltd (Mrs Jayne Cashmore) [5447]	<p>Site 59 Golden End Farm, Knowle (ref A4) is assessed as 'amber' but is within a parcel of highly performing green belt.</p> <p>Site 413 Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (ref A5) is very large given the proposed green belt boundary of Grove Road and Norton Green Lane.</p>
Q38	Mr Adrian Baker [3433]		<p>I object to Ref A5 Call for Sites 413 being included. These sites are high quality Green Belt and must be retained as such. To include these sites would be an inappropriate intrusion into quality Green Belt which benefits the whole of the Knowle & Dorridge community. there are more suitable sites in the "gap" between Knowle and Solihull along the M42</p>
Q38	Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]		<p>Amber sites A4 and A5</p> <p>It is right that sites at Golden End Drive and Blue Lake Road, Dorridge should be omitted having regard to, in particular, Green Belt considerations and in principle objections</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Andrew Shakes [6180]		Land off Blue Lake Road (A5) Plan should omit Site 413 land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge as a site for residential development. Surrounding roads, Knowle Wood Road, Blue Lake Road and Grove Road are already congested, not just in peak hours. Over 400 dwellings already added to Knowle/Dorridge, significantly constraining roads and parking. A further 900-950 dwellings on Site 9 and Amber Site A5 would increase congestion further, creating hazards for pedestrians and additional parking for station. Impacts will spread to surrounding roads, such as Darley Green Road, Grove Road and Knowle Wood Road.
Q38	Mr Anthony Baines [5764]		Amber site A5 - Blue Lake Road This part of Dorridge is already not coping with additional traffic, parking and services provision . The nature and character of the area would be fundamentally changed negatively.
Q38	Mr Antony Cooper [6017]		Site 413 should be omitted KDBH cannot sustain the level of proposed development- additional site would add a further 340 dwellings Considerable road congestion already occurs at peak hours, site would significantly increase traffic, adding air and noise pollution and creating road safety issues. Sites 8 and 9 will already compromise principles in N Plan Site 413 is currently surrounded by low density housing, the proposed density would not allow a sensitive transition between open countryside and built environment. Site would put greater strain on vital community services, particularly health
Q38	Mr Bob Holtham [3530]		OBJECT: A5 Blue Lake Road, Dorridge. The majority of this site is in Knowle. Only at one point in Blue Lake Road itself would it constitute Dorridge. As such it would add to the pressure on highways and parking as large portions of the site lack accessibility and would not well connected to either Knowle or Dorridge. This would be a completely unacceptable encroachment into the green belt. SUPPORT: A7 Widney Manor Road. An already busy route through to Solihull with limited additional impact on Highways.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Brett Hopkins [5886]		<p>Land at Mount Daily farm, Cheswick Green (ref A2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The land is with in the washed over green belt - The proposal of 10 dwellings would impact on urban sprawl would lead to overdevelopment of this area on the border line green belt fields. - Flooding to the rear of Coppice Walk is prevalent and in May 2018 the gardens and houses could not cope with the flood waters coming off the car garage, houses and land behind. - The contamination of the ground from the petroleum pumps on the garage. - Access onto an accident hotspot road that is currently at a 40mph speed limit.
Q38	Mr Brian Hillman [6003]		I object to Ref A5 & Ref 413 being included. This is Green Belt land grabbing on a large scale totally unnecessary in this already over developed community of Knowle & Dorridge.
Q38	Mr Bruce Richard [5691]		Amber site A7. Area identified as not having an 'open' character. This conflicts with findings of the Solihull Green Belt Assessment 2016, the LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt 2011 and an appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road. The potential inclusion of this land would not create a logical boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places.
Q38	Mr Craig Newton [5313]		<p>Land r/o 575A to 587 Tanworth Lane, Cheswick Green (ref A1)</p> <p>Concerns over how many homes are being built in Cheswick green area. no care is being taken to improve the roads so therefore more and more traffic is on the road making it harder to get of my village.</p> <p>There are no proposed new schools, doctors.</p> <p>Drainage concerns: cross roads garage is an active fuel station so the contamination (due to potential flooding) would be a big worry for residents on this road.</p>
Q38	Mr Daniel Wilson [5282]		<p>Blythe & Shirley</p> <p>Land r/o 575A to 587 Tanworth Lane, Cheswick Green (ref A1)</p> <p>There has been enough developed in Cheswick Green and more development is opposed.</p> <p>We have already had to put up with years of disruption, noise and site traffic to Cheswick Place development</p>
Q38	Mr Darren Douglas [5276]		<p>Address 112 and the proposed development would be next door.</p> <p>The proposed development will impact on the local area.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Darren Douglas [5276]		<p>amber sites 134, 205 and 308</p> <p>The inclusion of Amber omitted sites gives the promoters of these sites a 'way in' which in our view is contrary to the Council's own assessment and conclusions reached.</p> <p>We do not agree with the methodology of the site selection process. On the basis the Council have identified sites to assess, assessed them against the site hierarchy and categorised the sites as an allocation, potential allocation, unlikely allocation and no allocation, it is not 'good planning' to then ignore this assessment and consult on the Amber omitted sites.</p>
Q38	Mr Dave Turner [5344]		<p>Amber - A1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Increased risk of flash flooding - area already floods significantly 2) Reduced security - Creating public access to the rear of garden will reduce security 3) Development unlikely to be in keeping with the character of the area - majority of the area is low rise and open. Developers rarely keep to the character (i.e. 3 storey houses built on Cheswick Place)
Q38	Mr David Colledge [5401]		<p>Amber ref A4 - Golden End Farm, Knowle</p> <p>Infrastructure will not support this site and extra families</p> <p>We believe the addition of 250 houses will inevitably mean at least 250 and possibly up to 500 extra vehicles on our local roads and up to an additional 1000 people trying to access resources in the village is simply not sustainable.</p>
Q38	Mr David Harris [5588]		<p>I object to the inclusion of Golden End Farm RefA4 as an amber site and should be omitted from the draft local plan</p> <p>ie Kenilworth Road, Kixley Lane-Grand Union Canal. Kixley Lane mentioned as early as 1327 Kix(cow parsley Ley left fallow). A well trodden path for locals to the canal, also by holiday narrow boats/mooring and walking into Knowle with cow parsley each side. The other old lanes have become residential roads, Kixley Lane has retained its rural charm. Development adjacent would spoil this historical lane. It should remain unspoilt for future generations as</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr David Patterson [5526]		Amber site A7. Area identified as not having an 'open' character. This conflicts with findings of the Solihull Green Belt Assessment 2016, the LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt 2011 and an appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road. The potential inclusion of this land would not create a logical boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places.
Q38	Mr David Power [5941]		I object to Ref A5 & Ref 413 being included. These sites are premium Green Belt and must be left as such. To include these sites is unnecessary and would be an unnecessary use of Green Belt which is currently enjoyed by Knowle & Dorridge residents. There are large areas of land suitable to be included in future residential development plans in the "gap" between Knowle and Solihull where the M42 already impacts on the area
Q38	Mr Dean Henry [6161]		Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road, Knowle (Ref A4) We support the OMISSION of this site for development as it falls within a Green Belt parcel that scores highly and the existing road infrastructure is not able to support the additional traffic that will be generated. Knowle High Street is already a bottleneck for traffic and for people travelling to Solihull for additional amenities, e.g. shopping and access to the M42 for access to Birmingham and the motorway network. Additional houses the wrong side of Knowle will increase the burden of traffic on Knowle High Street, particularly in rush hour periods.
Q38	Mr Don Grantham [5489]		Amber site A5 and 413. I object to Ref A5 & Ref 413 being included. These sites are very high quality Green Belt and must be retained. To include these sites is unnecessary and is an inappropriate intrusion into quality Green Belt which benefits the Knowle & Dorridge community. There are large areas of land suitable to be included in future residential development plans in the "gap" between Knowle and Solihull where the M42 already influences the open space should additional land be required.
Q38	Mr Duncan Turner [5275]		Land r/o 114 to 118 Widney Manor Road, Solihull (ref A7) Reasons for objection: 1) Access road would be in an unsafe "blindspot" location 2) Disruption to traffic flow on a road that is congested daily at rush-hour 3) Destruction of mature gardens, notable change in local character

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Eric Homer [3721]		<p>The following amber sites should be included in preference to developing site 26 & site 4:</p> <p>Land r/o 575A to 587 Tanworth Lane, Cheswick Green (ref A1) - backland development that will not impact on openness.</p> <p>Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road, Knowle (ref A4) - highly accessible, close to employment in Solihull town centre/UK Central.</p> <p>Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (ref A5) - lower performing green belt, close to Solihull town centre/UK Central.</p> <p>Rowood Drive, Solihull (ref A6) - urban site well suited to housing and not used for Amber Site A4</p>
Q38	Mr Francis Cooper [5761]		<p>Inappropriate development in an Historic Conservation Area.</p> <p>Overlooked by surrounding hills near Barston.</p> <p>Very close to my property, with a loss of views across the fields, which would devalue my home.</p> <p>Kixley Lane is a dead end with many footpaths leading of it and popular for walkers, and an ancient route used before the Church was built in 1300's.</p> <p>It's an Historic area.</p> <p>Fields proposed are fertile with Clay subsoil and have never been fallow in the 25 years I have lived here.</p> <p>Plans suggest parking for the School, but the car park near the Church is now less busy.</p>
Q38	Mr Frank Arnold [6149]		<p>Amber A5:</p> <p>This would be a significant intrusion into the Green Belt.</p> <p>The impact upon Kixley Lane, both during construction and after building.</p> <p>Residents of the the new development would being given access to the Canal walks with the potential of destroying what has been an historically attractive entrance for dog walkers and Ramblers to various scenic walks.</p> <p>The impact on the village of Knowle, where traffic and parking is already a growing issue.</p> <p>Other infrastructure issues like schooling and access to Doctors - both of which are</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Geoffrey Onyett [5901]		<p>Land off Blue Lake Road (ref A5) The inclusion of site 413 (ref A5) is unnecessary in view of the proposed 900+ dwellings at Knowle and the Arden triangle. The local infrastructure would be overwhelmed by the additional capacity. The promoter's vision of high housing density for the site is out of character with the surrounding area. A valued local area of visually interesting green belt would be lost. Allocation of site is not in accordance with the KDBH Neighbourhood Plan Land release of this scale was not something that was an option considered in the 2018 Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Strategic Locations Study.</p>
Q38	Mr Graham Bowskill [5247]		<p>I support the fact that the Blue Lake site with the number of houses suggested should be omitted as this would over burden the present traffic network, creating chaos in Blue Lake Road, Darley Green Road and Norton Green Lane. This is already busy network and there is no way in which improvements could be made without severe consequences to the environment.</p>
Q38	mr Graham Cockroft [5780]		<p>Both sites A1 and A2 are within the established settlement boundary of Cheswick Green village. Development of either should be judged on the merit of any particular proposal, <u>independently of the washed over status of the village.</u></p>
Q38	Mr Graham Thomas [5361]		<p>There is also no apparent space to improve the Village Centre - How can any central site be allocated for more housing? Why not consider sites 172, 227 and 236 for example?</p>
Q38	Mr Gregory Lawson [5960]		<p>I particularly object to Land off Blue Lake Road (Ref A5) and 413. This is an area of key green belt which is fundamental to maintaining the existing character of the land and the essential separation between it and Dorridge. The Mayor has recently stated that we should not be using green belt. There are plenty of other non green belt sites available in the borough. Traffic in Dorridge has increased massively since the inappropriate and oversized Sainsburys opened. The roads around this amber site are simply not sufficient to sustain a development like this.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Harvey Scriven [3790]		<p>Strongly object to Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road (ref A4) being included.</p> <p>This goes against government green belt planning policy.</p> <p>Local infrastructure is already struggling with increased traffic (eg twice in last 6 weeks, gas leaks have been caused on Kenilworth Road due to damage from increased traffic).</p> <p>Case not made as to why Knowle is expected to take the brunt of development from across the borough. Knowle has poor public transport, a narrow high street and very limited local employment. These do not meet your own criteria for development sites.</p> <p>Solihull has 1,200 empty homes - please use these first.</p>
Q38	Mr Ian Leedham [5887]		<p>Golden End Farm, Knowle (ref A4)</p> <p>I object to development around Golden end farm given its Green Belt status, encroachment and that Knowle will struggle to sustain further development.</p>
Q38	Mr Jeff Sant [5324]		<p>Concern over flooding due to more housing.</p> <p>Environmental concerns regarding the garage being potentially removed which will require the removal of the underground fuel tank. The site is also green belt and should remain so.</p> <p>The proposed exit from the site onto Tanworth Lane is an accident waiting to happen. The road is narrow with a blind bend and is already having to cope with the excess traffic now exiting the previously mentioned development between Tanworth Lane and Coppice Walk.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr John Hornby [5851]		<p>There is a strong, objective case not to include Site 413 (ref A5 and extended from Sites 104 and 109) as a site for residential development within the Local Plan.</p> <p>That case is made in detail in the representation but in summary it is founded on factors relating to the past and proposed level of development in KDBH and on specific considerations relating to the site itself:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Already current strain on infrastructure from recent housing developments - Area could not cope with development of sites 8 and 9 and Amber sites. In particular road infrastructure - already chronic congestion at peak times (Station Rd and Knowle High Street) - More attention to be paid to the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Housing Market Area Strategic Locations Study. (The Study did not propose large scale housing development for Knowle and Dorridge). - No traffic impact study or mitigation measures proposed - Concern regarding impact on Knowle Conservation Area - The Neighbourhood Plan needs to be better taken into account. In particular issues regarding Village Character and Natural Environment. - The Vision Document for site 413 (Amber site A5) has not been published or been the subject of public consultation. - Site assessment methodology is flawed as it scores down landscape character in areas that contain ribbon development - No consultation with KDBH Neighbourhood Forum over this site - Green Belt Assessment is at odds with that performed on substantially the same site in last local Plan - Arden triangle development is questionable. Findings of Crestwood Environmental Landscape and Visual appraisal need to be taken into account. - Land release of Arden triangle site and site 413 (A5) would result in wholesale coalescence of Knowle and Dorridge contrary to Green Belt objectives, national and local planning policy. <p>The KDBH Neighbourhood Plan, which is likely to be adopted in March 2019, supports this detailed assessment very robustly.</p>
Q38	Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]		<p>Amber Site reference A7 Call for Sites reference 308: Land between Widney Manor Station & Widney Manor Road.</p> <p>Concerns over access and visibility on to Widney Lane, capacity of this very busy through road not coping and increased parking issues close to station.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Keith May [5833]		I object to the land off Blue Lake Road (ref A5)(site 431) being included as an area for potential housing development because: - this is green belt land which provides a corridor for walkers, cyclists, horse riders etc to access the countryside from a residential area - building over 350 houses will put extreme pressure on local services such as schools and doctors surgeries - there will be increased local traffic on what is already a busy cut through for motorists driving from Lapworth and Warwick into Solihull - the density of housing and associated traffic will increase local pollution levels
Q38	Mr Lee Thomas [5301]		In reference to site 100: Mount Dairy Farm. Already over development. Permission to build a large extension to rear of 14-22 Archer Drive already under construction. South-Eastern shadow will form over gardens to the rear, rainwater from its higher ground onto Archer Drive which gets bogged. MD Farm part of local heritage of village. This land (100) should under no circumstances be developed. Will turn rural location into a dense urban corner of a beautiful village.
Q38	Mr M Trentham [2114]		Amber site A4 - This is an unwarranted projection into a highly scoring area of the Green Belt, which does not round-off the settlement in any way. There are many far less damaging sites available and this one should be changed to Red. If anything this area should be considered for the replacement football ground, rather than the prominent and visually intrusive area north of Site 8.
Q38	Mr M Trentham [2114]		Amber site A5 - This site is better in most respects than Site 8 and should be considered as a substitute, and included as Amber. It provides a sensible rounding off to the settlement.
Q38	Mr M Trentham [2114]		Amber site A7 - The Widney Manor Road area, with boundaries as shown around the built development should be removed from the Green Belt thus making A7 redundant, as development Site 134 should then become Green.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Malcolm Robinson [5279]		<p>Rowood Drive, Solihull (ref A6)</p> <p>We strongly object to the sale and proposed housing development on the following grounds.</p> <p>Increased traffic, noise and air pollution in an already congested area (Exit from the Jaguar Land Rover site onto Rowood Drive was prohibited some years ago)</p> <p>Loss of Green belt land to development which is used by local community and should remain as a recreational area.</p> <p>Loss of wildlife and habitats</p> <p>Additional load on sewerage and drainage services resulting in potential flooding</p> <p>The development could disturb Japanese Knotweed present on this site and cause it to spread to neighbouring gardens</p>
Q38	Mr Mark Whitehouse [5383]		<p>A5 Site 413 - Development on this scale in addition to what is already planned would destroy the character of Dorridge.</p> <p>Infrastructure would be crippled and the additional traffic created would cause a significant health and safety risk.</p> <p>Much green belt land would be lost, hedgerows destroyed as well as many mature oak trees, which would affect wildlife.</p> <p>Inevitably property prices would be adversely affected in surrounding areas, causing hardship to many.</p> <p>With 950 units already in the plan, I consider KDBH have accommodated more than enough housing development in the Birmingham area.</p>
Q38	Mr Mark Wilson [5521]		<p>Rowood Drive, Solihull (ref A6) to be included in the local plan.</p> <p>Subject: Creation of an Enhanced Community Sports Facility at Lode Heath School</p> <p>I am writing to you to seek the Councils consent to the disposal of land at Rowood Drive, which forms a part of the Lode Heath School estate. Our proposal is to use the income from that disposal to significantly enhance the range of sports facilities available, by replacing the existing outdated Gymnasium, as well as constructing a replacement football pitch on the school site- with plans for community use changing facilities and meeting rooms.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Martin Archer [3315]		I do not agree that the land adjacent to Blue Lake Road and Norton Green Lane should be taken for development. The issues of infrastructure and the lack of any solutions to the additional immense pressures on roads, parking, rail station parking etc is again paramount. Most infrastructure around Knowle and Dorridge is unchanged in 50 years and cannot in anyway cope with the additional pressures created by this level of housing. This land is also high quality Green Belt and should be left as such
Q38	Mr Martin Guy [5969]		I object to the Amber site proposal Ref. A4/Site 59 Golden End Farm, Knowle. This would severely impact the character of Kixley Lane and the canal which is an important feature of the historic town of Knowle. Removal of green belt status, paving the way for development, severely impacts an important local amenity in Knowle.
Q38	Mr Martin Parsons [5847]		Site Ref: A6. Extra traffic on a already busy road. Green belt land being lost. Foxes nest on this site. Children play on here and people also walk dogs every day here. This will also put extra pressure on the old sewage system. Plus my major issue is the devaluation of my property.
Q38	Mr Michael Harper [1912]		Ref A4 - I favour Golden End Farm site - it is well related to the village and has contained boundaries
Q38	Mr Michael Harper [1912]		Ref A5 - The Blue Lake Road site worries me. Taken together with The Arden Triangle, it would bring too much weight of housing to that part of Knowle and would destroy the village character. At present it has some housing but the general appearance and feel is rural or semi rural and this should be retained at all costs
Q38	Mr Nicholas Spence [5636]		Amber site A6 - Rowood Drive site is not suitable size for what is proposed and will congest an already extremely busy road and junction that causes serious problems at all times. Unless serious redevelopment of the lode lane junction was to happen, this would be a disaster.
Q38	Mr Nicholas Thornley [5680]		Amber Site Ref A7 (Site 205) Recently I submitted my comments on Amber Site 134 (ID 7804) without knowing that this site is only a small part of a much bigger site ref 205. In particular I am interested in the status of the strip of vacant land that runs past the back of The Spinney? I submit that the whole of Amber Site ref 205 should remain as Greenbelt on the basis that the existing road network around the site cannot cope with any more properties or access roads

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Nicholas Thornley [5680]		<p>Re Amber Site ref A7 (site 134)</p> <p>I understand that Government Planning has two main criteria for backyard developments:</p> <p>1)The development must be in keeping with the character and quality of its surroundings:</p> <p>How can any development, let alone one with up to 22 dwellings, fit in with the massive and highly expensive row of properties from 112 to 124 Widney Manor Road?</p> <p>2)The development must be convenient and safe for both pedestrians and drivers:</p> <p>The access road shown on is roughly in the middle of a very short stretch of</p>
Q38	Mr Paul Salamon [5509]		<p>Amber Site A5 - The local plan should not include 413 as it would significantly compromise the local area due to the inability of the local roads and infrastructure to cope with a large increase in traffic usage. Such a large development will destroy the uniqueness of Dorridge.</p> <p>There are other areas adjacent to the motorway which would be better location for new housing such as 207 which already has better road infrastructure and proximity to Solihull town centre which would also allow residents to travel into town without having to use cars.</p>
Q38	Mr Phillip Griffiths [5939]		<p>Land r/o 114 to 118 Widney Manor Road (ref A7)</p> <p>Reference Sites 134, 205 and 308</p> <p>I strongly object to the removal of these areas from the Green Belt. Site 134 was the subject of a refused Planning Application (2010/2) and the Appeal(APP/Q4625/A/10/2133554) which followed was dismissed at the Inquiry. I can see nothing which has changed to now justify the removal of these sites from the Green Belt.</p> <p>The embankment and wildlife corridor to the rear of site ref A7 is the subject of a Section 106 Agreement to protect it in its current state. Any development may affect this.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		Blue Lake Road ref A5 It is hard to understand that Dorridge which is well served with amenities and public transport has no housing allocated. Site 43 Kenilworth Road, Balsall Common There are several small sites in Balsall Common which it is hard to understand being omitted. Land by the Railway Inn and the Antiques Barn.
Q38	Mr Richard King [5877]		Golden End Farm (A4) - Support for site not being included in Plan. Object to reclassification as an amber site. - Erosion of Green Belt: The site is prime quality arable farming land. There are many alternatives where the land is of less agricultural value. - Increased Traffic Volume and Congestion: Traffic through village already extremely busy. Kenilworth Road/ Warwick Road, Wilson Road/Station Road intersections are already unsatisfactory. Concern re Council Officers comments if further problems arose the Council would 'respond'. Better to have a proactive rather than reactive planning strategy to what is an inevitable problem. - Overloading Knowle: Large volumes of traffic already flow through Knowle, to the detriment of the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. Inconceivable to have another large development if Arden Triangle and Hampton Road are developed. Better to look at parts of Dorridge/Bentley Heath if further development required where access to Solihull/M42 is closer.
Q38	Mr Richard Poole [5400]		Amber ref A4 I object to the inclusion of Golden End Farm Ref A4 as an 'amber' site, and believe this should be permanently omitted from the plan. The area designated is highly scoring green belt (11) and must be preserved to keep the rural charm of Knowle. Kixley Lane is used daily by walkers, dog walkers, cyclists, and canal traffic, due to its countryside feel and historical beauty I use this route frequently and believe development adjacent to Kixley Lane would
Q38	Mr Robert Hayes [5436]		Site A4 - Golden End Farm. The built development in Kixley Lane was commissioned by the Council For those then working locally in agriculture and is now a conservation area

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Robin Easterby [5943]		<p>Please see attached letter. This is a blatant example of Garden Grabbing in the Green Belt!</p> <p>Re: Land r/o 114/118 Widney Manor road (ref A7).</p> <p>(Letter not attached on JDi. Email sent 09.05.19 to respondent, Robin Easterby via PSP email address. Email reply on 09.05.19 stating that he was unable to resend letter but..."I suspect you may already have seen similar contents from other objecting residents on Widney Manor Road as it was a standard letter recommended by the Widney Manor Action Group. Basically I object to the proposed development as it would fundamentally change the nature of the area, is green belt, and is an example of garden grabbing at its worst. The traffic along Widney Manor Road has dramatically increased since I moved into 136 and the proposal will only make matters worse."</p>
Q38	Mr Roger Cook [2962]		<p>Amber sites at Blue Lake Road (A5) and Golden End Farm (A4), if adopted, will completely destroy the character of Knowle village. The infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional housing that will be built especially if the existing sites under consideration, Arden Triangle and Hampton Road are approved. There is already serious road traffic congestion through Knowle and these wholly unsuitable developments will completely clog up the village as new residents need to travel through the village to get to Birmingham or the M42. They are located on the wrong side (south) of the village.</p>
Q38	Mr Roger Marshall [5339]		<p>Amber A4 - Golden End Farm</p> <p>Existing Greenbelt boundary should be maintained</p> <p>Knowle as a village does not have the capacity for more residents - it is important to keep the village feel</p>
Q38	Mr Roy Ethell [5695]		<p>Amber site A5 - There is a strong case not to include Site 413 for residential development within the Local Plan. The safety and infrastructure issues of this site which will without any doubt go against The Neighbourhood Plan should it be adopted in March 2019</p>
Q38	Mr Sheikh Rahman [5548]		<p>Amber Site A6 - Rowood Drive</p> <p>Loss of wild life and green space</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Stephen Bumpas [5920]		<p>Rowood Drive (ref A6) Strongly object on the following grounds:</p> <p>Traffic around Rowood Drive is already congested and endangers lives, with JLR Lorries using it as a cut through.</p> <p>Green Belt land is being lost in an already built up area of Solihull. This proposal and the loss of Green Belt land for JLR on Old Damson Lane will significantly reduce the open land either end of Damson Wood.</p> <p>Extra pressure on utility systems.</p> <p>Removal of old oak tree, and disruption of Japanese Knotweed.</p> <p>Effect on overlooking properties.</p>
Q38	Mr Steve Dixon [5556]		<p>Amber Site A6 - Rowood Drive. Less green space (more green belt sold off) Cheated local residents by not cutting grass, preventing the community from using the space. I have been mowing a section of this area for 8 years for my children. Higher congestion Pressure on sewage system Loss of wildlife</p>
Q38	Mr T Thomas [2538]		<p>When the next LDP consultation takes place in under 15 years more land will be needed and should be taken into account in developing this plan. Current Amber and Red sites should be reconsidered in the light of this rather than the current <u>short term view</u>.</p>
Q38	Mr Tony Moon [4964]		<p>I write in response to the new "Amber" designation covering a possible housing development at Golden End Farm, Knowle (Ref: M/Site 59) to which I object most strongly. My reasons for this are threefold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Three development sites in Knowle with one between Knowle and Dorridge would seem to be an unfair imposition on Knowle. 2) Increased pressure on infrastructure and local services in Knowle, particularly relating to traffic and parking. 3) Destruction of high-quality Green Belt land compared with lower scoring

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mr Tony Smith [6124]		Land off Blue Lake Road should not be considered an 'Amber Site' as it is not a 'less harmful' site due to character of the area, impact on a thoroughly used green belt farm, traffic and highway control. Impact on local residents already having travel, traffic and parking issues on Grove Road, Knowle Wood Road, Blue Lake Road, Avenue Road, Dorridge Road and Station Road when heading to the village High St. This will cause far too much harm to the existing issues. No highway report has been done and nothing has been clarified about the roads.
Q38	Mr Tristram Oliver [5218]		Support for Amber Sites Objection to Site 4 - see Rep ID 10396
Q38	Mr Udaya Shetty [5570]		I strongly object to the sale and housing development at Rowood Drive Ref A6 on the following grounds -Traffic arond Rowood drive is already congested and endagers lives. -More green belt land being lost in an already builtup area of Solihull. -Loss of wildlife and their habitats(rabbits, foxes, newts etc) -loss of green space for the community to use. -Extra pressure on sewage system. -Effect of disruption of building on a site with japanee Knotweed to the surrounding area. -Effect on house prices of overlooking properties. -Stronly object on the drug editcs, drunk people, on occupying the social houses.
Q38	Mr William Gilroy [5611]		Golden End Farm A4 should be designated green belt land. The area to the side of Kixley Lane is "countryside" easily accessed from Knowle village by persons of limited mobility. It gives Kixley Lane a classic country lane feel, unlike any other with easy access from the Village centre.
Q38	Mr. Andreas Welzel [3137]		I would like to support the inclusion of the Land r/o of 146 to 152 Tilehouse Lane, Whitlock's End (currently amber). This should also be extended to include Site reference 84 (see response to Q39).
Q38	MRrs Rittu Maini [5289]		NOT ENOUGH FACILITIES COMPARE TO MORE HOUSES BUILT TANWORTH LANE IS OVER 1 MILE LONG THERE IS NO BUS SERVICES NO BUS STOPS PUBLIC TRANSPORT IS VERY POOR IN AREA IT IS NO EXACTLY SAFE FOR PEDESTRIANS AS IT IS VERY NARROW WALKWAY ON BOTH SIDES MOST OF TIME IT IS COVERED WITH LONG BUSHES TRAFFIC ON THE ROAD HAS GONE EXTREMELY BUSY SINCE NEW ESTATE HAS BEEN BUILT THERE IS NO TRAFFIC CONTROL OR PEDESTRIAN CROSSING EITHER

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Alexandra Creba [5675]		Amber site A5 - Blue Lake Road, Dorridge - omit site 413 from the LDP - Strain on the local resources - too many houses already built in the KDBH area - no local bus stop - disagree with the visual impact based on the Landscape Character Assessment -
Q38	Mrs Emma Jane Watson [5862]		Objection to Amber site A5. Golden End Farm should remain as Green Belt: - Demolition of top grade Green Belt land. (Site scores highly in green belt assessment report 2016. Other sites that scored significantly lower such as site 13 have retained their green belt status) - Impact on traffic at the junction with Warwick Road and Kenilworth Road. Impact of additional traffic on already busy roads. - Knowle infrastructure unable to cope with the increased population from all the additional sites that are to be developed in Knowle. Dorridge is better equipped to cope with an increase in population yet no sites are put forward for development.
Q38	Mrs Emma Jane Watson [5862]		Site Ref A4 - Petition signed by 48 local residents. Demolition of top grade Green Belt land. (Site scores highly in green belt assessment report 2016. Other sites that scored significantly lower such as site 13 have retained their green belt status) Impact on traffic on already busy roads and at the junction with Warwick Road and Kenilworth Road. Infrastructure unable to cope with the increased population from all the additional sites that are to be developed in Knowle. Dorridge is better equipped to cope with an increase in population yet no sites are put forward for development.
Q38	Mrs Katie Wilson [5233]		- Amber sites should be protected and not built on - Solihull in danger of becoming a sprawling extension of Birmingham. - Congestion in the whole borough is already unacceptable. - The more large developments approved for high prices small footprint
Q38	Mrs Margaret Gosling [6101]		Amber sites on Tanworth Lane, Cheswick Green should not be considered. In Green belt and would spoil nature of area already very busy. Some are "Garden Grabbing" which is not acceptable. Flood risk to Cheswick Green would increase as close to Blythe flood plain. Lack of infrastructure for more housing here. The parish has already had to take more than its share of new development with Cheswick Place and Blithy Valley. This must be completed before any more is considered so the full impact can be determined.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Alison Beach [5805]		I object strongly to the amber classification of A4, Golden End Farm. It should remain green belt and undeveloped because a) it is widely appreciated by the public as open space for walking, cycling etc as it runs along the canal b) Kenilworth Rd is already dangerous, especially with many heavy goods vehicles accessing no.114 (equestrian business opposite Site A4, currently with application PL/2019/00146/PPFL to extend into large scale operations) and also other building sites c) 3 extra development sites close together in Knowle would be impossible for road infrastructure to handle. Alternative sites exist which could manage traffic better.
Q38	Mrs Angela Hamilton [5329]		I object to the land at r/o 114 to 118Widney Manor Road being down graded to Amber. My property is adjacent to this land. I feel building here will be detrimental to the area, increase traffic & air pollution, and spoil the general area. I feel this will impact negatively on house prices within this over 55s estate.
Q38	Mrs Angela Kenning [5617]		Rowood Drive - Site A6. I strongly object to the sale and proposed housing development at Rowood Drive Ref A6 on the following grounds:- Traffic around Rowood Drive already congested and endangers lives more traffic will also have an impact on the surrounding est. The loss of habitat for wildlife Loss of green space for children to play, Extra pressure on sewage system and drainage Effect of house prices of overlooking properties It will also have an impact on doctors surgeries
Q38	Mrs Anna Holden [6175]		Amber Site A4 B93 Facebook group claims that this update of the plan includes land adjacent to Kixley Ln. If so, this would be completely unacceptable, Kixley Ln is a beautiful 14th century relic and it, along with the footpath route to the canal pedestrian bridge should be kept in agricultural use.
Q38	Mrs Betty Norris [5475]		Amber site ref: A4 Perhaps the most important and drastic is the impact of vehicles. there is already gridlock on Kenilworth Road and Hampton Road. Other things to consider - school places, doctor's surgery, dentists, parking spaces, sewage pumping, loss of arable land. Makes reference to the BBC1 TV programme on Feb 15th. 20,000 abandoned or derelict homes. Should be pursuing that avenue before putting any more precious green arable land under concrete.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Betty Norris [5475]		Amber site: A4 Destruction of the last remaining old lane in Knowle which is loved and used by many. Developers will then begin to look at the Wet Meadow (SSSI) with the widening of Kixley lane as possible next step. Perhaps the most important and drastic is the impact of vehicles. there is already gridlock on Kenilworth Road and Hampton Road. Other things to consider include school places, doctor's surgery, dentists, parking spaces, sewage pumping, loss of arable land. Should be pursuing redevelopment of abandoned and derelict homes before putting any more precious green arable land under concrete.
Q38	Mrs C Spelman MP [2073]		Amber site A4 Residents are concerned about proposals to develop the land and remove the site from the Green Belt. Kixley Lane is one of the last remaining old lanes in the village and they are seeking assurance that the openness of the Green Belt will be preserved. They are also concerned about the impact on local infrastructure and services with increased traffic and housing at this site.
Q38	Mrs Caroline Albanese [5532]		I strongly object to the sale and housing development at Rowood Drive Ref A6 on the following grounds; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic around Rowood Drive is already congested and endangers lives. - More Green Belt land being lost in an already built up area of Solihull. - Loss of wildlife and their habitats (rabbits, foxes, newts etc.) - Loss of green space for the community to use (dog walking, children playing). - Extra pressure on sewage system. - Effect of disruption of building on a site with Japanese Knotweed to the surrounding area. - Effect on house prices of overlooking properties.
Q38	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		Blue Lake Road ref A5 Dorridge is well provided to accommodate new housing. Balsall Common Land by The Railway Inn and the Antiques Barn (Site 43) in Balsall Common could be included.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Cathy Lynock [5437]		<p>Site A4 - Golden End Farm. I wish to express my concern regarding the proposed use of land adjacent to Kixley Lane for a further development of housing. Solihull Council has approximately 1200 empty/derelict houses, but rather to renovate these, the council are considering taking more countryside.</p> <p>Kixley Lane should not have houses built near it, it needs to stay as it is. This is green belt/farm land and needs keeping this way. . We live on Hampton Road and have already been subjected to the development by Miller Homes; we lost the fields behind us - tragic.</p>
Q38	Mrs Christine Thorp [5882]		<p>It would appear that over 50% of the omitted sites are Knowle, Dorridge, Solihull addresses. It would appear that the existing plan is disproportionate to develop and fill up Shirley's only remaining Green corridors between already heavily populated developments and to produce an ever increasing sprawl with no green boundaries.</p>
Q38	Mrs Claire Hill [5417]		<p>Site 59 Kixley Lane - This site should be omitted because it would cause a massive traffic flow problem down Kixley Lane and also along the Kenilworth Road. - Kenilworth Road is already extremely busy and living in Cook Close I find it very difficult to cross the road at all times. - Kixley Lane is a very old established lane and would not benefit from having traffic up and down it. Also has an entrance to the school, so at times the lane is already congested with traffic collecting children and dropping them off at the school.</p>
Q38	Mrs Clare Heath [5871]		<p>please see attached letter</p>
Q38	Mrs Deborah Dixon [5571]		<p>I strongly object to to sale and housing development at Rowood Drive ref A6. This land is used by the public for dog walking also by children on an everyday basis. My children whom some have disabilities would have to walk far to be able to a find space to play therefore would not be able to go out regularly which have a huge impact on their recovery. . Wildlife will be effected. Traffic already a problem around lode lane and Rowood Drive this will endanger lives. Already struggle with blocked drain/sewage this will put extra pressure on the system.</p>
Q38	Mrs Diane McClure [5520]		<p>Rowood Drive ref A6 site188 Playing Field Location of the site being near the junction of Rowood Drive and Lode Lane it will increase the traffic on Rowood Drive which is a busy road and increasing the difficulty of negotiating the junction with Lode Lane. The playing field is currently used by local residents for recreation and dog walking and up to the time when grass cutting ceased by children and adults (from nearby business units) playing games. There is a shortage of green spaces in this area that are not privately owned that can be used for these purposes.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs E Hedley [3516]		The difficulties posed by the location of around 950 new houses have not been adequately addressed by the Council so it is difficult to see how the siting of an additional 590 houses can do anything but make the situation very much worse. Whether some or part of these sites could be brought forward as better alternatives to the already allocated sites needs further consideration based on a clearer understanding of the site hierarchy assessment methodology and the proposed mitigation of any impacts upon the area See also the response of the Forum which I support and fully endorse.
Q38	Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [6162]		I support the comments submitted by KDBH Neighbourhood Forum
Q38	Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [6162]		I support the submission made by the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum
Q38	Mrs Elizabeth Slater [6083]		I object to the land called Golden End Farm being demoted from green belt to amber which is the first step to building on the land. Kixley Lane is an ancient lane and possibly the only one left in Knowle. The lane is used exclusively for walkers and canal boat users and we would lose this amenity if the land was developed.
Q38	Mrs Gwen Harris [5343]		Amber - Ref A7 I object to land r/o Widney manor road to be used as an amber site, or for it to be taken out of the green belt. The land is not suitable and is too narrow to build on. It would affect the safety of the road, which are already extremely busy, and would not cope with more congestion. The roads near the site are extremely hazardous for motorists and pedestrians.
Q38	Mrs Helen Baker [5930]		Ref A5 and Ref413 should not be included as these sites are high quality green belt land and must be retained a such. Green belt areas benefit all of the residence in the area and as much green belt should be maintained with building moved to the gaps between Knowle and Solihull where the M42 already has ruined the space.
Q38	Mrs Jackie Taylor [5555]		Amber site A6 - Rowood Drive. The volume of traffic along this road is already high and any more would be an accident waiting to happen. Lode Heath school have not maintained the ground for a few years stating that they were going to make it into a nature reserve for the school and grass and hedges would be left to encourage wildlife. With extra pressure on the sewage and water systems and the area looking like a built up city in a confined space the area would become less attractive to live in and house prices will be effected.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Jane Starling [3207]		<p>I support the omission of the site at Golden End Farm Knowle as this is in an area bordering the canal which is currently like open countryside. If it is filled in towards the Kenilworth Road it will have significant impact on the green belt feel.</p> <p>I have concerns that these Amber sites are on 'borrowed time' and will all be gobbled up eventually for more unnecessary housing</p>
Q38	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		<p>Blue Lake Road site (Ref. A5) and Site 59 at Kixley Road (Ref A4) should not be developed.</p> <p>Other Amber Sites should be developed, instead of Site 3 and Site 4 (except for SHFI AA Site 130).</p>
Q38	Mrs Jill Hillman [5492]		<p>Amber Site A5-Blue Lake Road. This would add to the over development and infrastructure pressure south of Knowle & Dorridge. Has the same high landscape value as land north of Grove Road as set out by Crestwood. A disproportionate land grab of Green Belt once again. This would irrecoverably change the environment and character of Knowle and Dorridge. I object to the Green Belt easily becoming downgraded and changeable to satisfy greedy landowners who disregard the landscape and the historic agricultural land which surrounds an already large residential area. I object conclusion in site assessment methodology for Blue Lake Road.</p>
Q38	Mrs Jill Osborne [6157]		<p>Do not destroy one of the most delightful rural areas in the West Midland Metropolitan region.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Jo Guy [6168]		<p>I would like to lodge my objections to Site 59 at Golden End Farm for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -There are no special or exceptional circumstances to justify the removal of this site from the Green Belt which is the highest scoring green belt site in the area. It is concerning that this site is being proposed in preference to sites North West of Bentley Heath and South West of Dorridge. - Other reasonable options have not been appropriately considered -The development will adversely impact on the conservation area and special character of Knowle. Land around Kixley Lane provides a stunning natural environment on the doorstep of the village - Knowle is already unreasonably overburdened with development, has experienced significant housing growth over the last 5 years. A further 950 houses will increase the number of properties in the area by around 25%. This would increase to 30% if the site at Golden End Farm was designated for development. It is not clear why Knowle is the focus of development sites when as stated there are numerous potential sites in the Dorridge and Bentley Heath areas, to say nothing of the 1200+ empty properties in and around Solihull and brownfield sites in and around areas like Shirley where there is considerable potential for redevelopment of sites that have already been previously developed. - infrastructure requirements will already far outstrip CIL contributions and additional development would not be sustainable. This is illustrated by the congested roads, the lack of primary school places, difficulty in accessing GP services and NHS dental services and the lack of parking.
Q38	Mrs Johanna Sahi-Proto [5391]		<p>Amber Site A7</p> <p>We consider the potential inclusion of Widney Manor Road and/or the land to the rear of 114 - 118 Widney Manor Road would not create a logical roll back of the Green Belt boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt.</p> <p>We consider the potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places. We support the Stop Garden Grabbing in Solihull campaign.</p>
Q38	Mrs Julia Gilroy [5637]		<p>Amber Site A4 (Golden End Farm) should be designated green belt land. The area to the side of Kixley Lane is "countryside" easily accessed from Knowle village by persons of limited mobility. It gives Kixley Lane a classic country lane feel, unlike any other with easy access from the Village centre.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Julia Gilroy [5637]		Amber site A5 (Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge) should remain green belt land. The promoters identification of capacity for 340 dwellings over 9.7ha. is too high density & will threaten the village nature/feel of the area. The village does not have the infrastructure nor capacity i.e. schools & health. The road network is already highly congested at peak times & this proposed increase in dwellings will make this worse plus increase pollution in the area.
Q38	Mrs Karen Dunn [5410]		<p>Object to development on the following sites</p> <p>Site 59 - Kixley Lane is the oldest road in Knowle with historical importance.</p> <p>Site 110 - From the canal you see a beautiful landscape on the edge of the village.</p> <p>Site 98 - Was a red site but now Amber. It's important for wildlife, is wooded with lots of animals living there</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of sites would result in loss of real village feel as you approach Knowle - Loss to landscape - Loss to wildlife - Lack of infrastructure - Traffic issues - Site 34 should be considered as an option

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Karen Tomkins [6121]		<p>The site should remain greenbelt - it is open and visible from several perspectives, visually pleasing and gives this part of Dorridge its semi-rural character</p> <p>Development of this site would run counter to the National Planning Policy Framework, the Spatial Policy, Local Plan and Neighbourhood plan. Any developments should be of a density characteristic of the local area. The immediate area "the Dorridge or Golden Triangle" has a distinctive character consisting of substantial family homes on large plots, in a semi-rural location (the greenbelt site). Development would undermine the qualities and defining characteristics of this area</p> <p>Believes there is a strong case to omit site 413 from the Local Plan as a site for residential development. It was rejected from inclusion in the last local plan however the Council now regards the land as a lower performing piece of green belt despite there being no changes. Disagrees with assessment of visual sensitivity of the land as being low. The land is open and visible from several perspectives. Land contains historic oak trees and there is a public footpath running through the area. Land gives this part of Dorridge its semi rural character. Development is not in keeping with the local character which goes against the NPPF, the Council's Spatial Plan, Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan. There are other red sites in the KDBH area which would objectively score much higher. Blue Lake Road and Norton Green Road are not capable of taking large amounts of traffic, would be difficult for homeowners to exit their properties safely. Public transport accessibility from the site is not high, residents will not walk to Dorridge Station, there is already an issue with rail users parking on Dorridge Road, there will not be enough parking at the station which will cause more overspill parking on local roads. There are other sites where housing development of the kind needed would be more in keeping with the density and character of the local area such as site 207.</p>
Q38	Mrs Katrina Jamieson [5817]		<p>Amber Site A7 - No more building on Widney Manor road between the station and the 6th form college</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Kay Pendleton [5968]		<p>Rowood Drive (ref A6)</p> <p>There is japanese knotweed on this location and it has already spread to nearby housing. We are concerned about the spread of this invasive plant with any building disruption to this site. We understand that Lode Heath School are treating it at the moment but local properties are still at risk.</p> <p>Traffic is already busy along this road and there has been numerous accidents on the junction with Lode Lane. Additional housing will make this worse.</p> <p>Also, there will be a detrimental effect on house prices that currently overlook a green space that is home to various wildlife.</p>
Q38	Mrs Kelly Bumpas [5923]		<p>Rowood Drive (ref A6)</p> <p>I strongly object on these grounds:</p> <p>Traffic around Rowood Drive is already congested & endangers lives, with Lorries using it as a cut through.</p> <p>Green Belt land is being lost in an already built up area of Solihull. This proposal and the loss of Green Belt land for JLR on Old Damson Lane will significantly reduce the open land either end of Damson Wood.</p> <p>Extra pressure on utility systems & services (police/doctors/schools/etc).</p> <p>Removal of old oak tree, & disruption of Japanese Knotweed.</p> <p>Effect on overlooking properties.</p> <p>Loss of Wildlife & Green Space.</p>
Q38	Mrs Linda Homer [3729]		<p>The following amber sites should be included in preference to developing site 26 & site 4:</p> <p>Land r/o 575A to 587 Tanworth Lane, Cheswick Green (ref A1) - backland development that will not impact on openness.</p> <p>Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road, Knowle (ref A4) - highly accessible, close to employment in Solihull town centre/UK Central.</p> <p>Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (ref A5) - lower performing green belt, close to Solihull town centre/UK Central.</p> <p>Rowood Drive, Solihull (ref A6) - urban site well suited to housing and not used for</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Lisa Mitchell [5498]		Amber site A7. Area identified as not having an 'open' character. This conflicts with findings of the Solihull Green Belt Assessment 2016, the LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt 2011 and an appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road. The potential inclusion of this land would not create a logical boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places.
Q38	Mrs Liz Eastwood [5961]		The site at Golden End Farm (ref A4) should be omitted. It is "high performing Green Belt" score 11.SMBC stated at a meeting of KDBH forum on 27 February that you could achieve your house building target by 2030 without using this land. NPPF February 2019 Para 136 requires that ..."Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified" which SMBC have not done. Knowle is being unfairly burdened with too many development sites. Traffic in Knowle High Street is congested at peak hours and parking is difficult.
Q38	Mrs Loretta Smith [5523]		In summary Site 413, Blue Lake Road should be omitted from the Plan as per the original proposals put forward by KDBH Neighborhood Plan (at the request of all the residents) and agreed at the time by Solihull Council. The KDBH Plan more than provides for all the housing needs of our area. This Site proposed would totally overstretch amenities, totally congest our small rural roads, affect our village community and would be highly inappropriate use of 'Farming' Green Belt Land which needs preserving, however small the 'pocket' of land is.
Q38	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		A5, Blue Lake Road. This is an opportunistic attempt to further extend the development area south of Knowle with the consequent infrastructure issues, Only the Blue Lake frontage is actually 'accessible' to Dorridge, the rest of the 'Vision' is an ill thought out random estate layout. This is an extremely valuable area of landscape setting with wide open views up to Grove Farm. If built on the whole development would be visible due to the topography.
Q38	Mrs Mary Clarke [5307]		I object to the amber status change to Golden End Farm Kenilworth Road Ref A4. This site safeguards the open countryside from encroachment by further urbanisation of Knowle through preserving the historic open approach to Knowle village. One boundary to Golden End Farm, Kixley Lane is a loved, ancient, unspoilt and still tranquil country lane recognisable to our forebears that would be destroyed by the Green Belt loss of Golden End Farm. Golden End Farm enhances and preserves the character and historic setting of Knowle through countryside views over fields and hedgerows to the ancient church tower and conservation area.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Miranda Turner-Morrell [5933]		Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (ref A5) 1) enormous strain on local infrastructure, roads, parking leading to additional congestion 2) lack of provision for additional school places and medical services 3) not at all in keeping with the character of the village or natural environment and will destroy local character 4) it will not 'sit well in the landscape' at all, we should be protecting greenbelt 5) will not be sympathetic to the low density development in the area 6) high visual sensitivity from Blue Lake Road and other local houses on Knowle Wood Road 7) very poor access to local bus routes
Q38	Mrs Pamela Robertson [5736]		Amber Site A7 - The gardens at the rear of 114-118 Widney Manor Road should remain green belt. Any future housing on this land would require access onto an already extremely narrow and busy bus route. Extra traffic attempting to access the road , particularly so close to a bend, would be very dangerous. There are already long queues at certain times of the day as drivers attempt to turn into a nearby school and college.
Q38	Mrs Patricia Hayes [5763]		Site A4 - Kixley Lane Farming land should not be lost at a time when it is needed. Wildlife habitat should be preserved. Bats present on the site.
Q38	Mrs Ruth Wolinski [5727]		Amber site A7 - Land to the rear of 114-118 Widney Manor Road should remain as Green Belt and should not be included in this consultation as the Council themselves refused a planning application in 2010 and the subsequent appeal was dismissed in 2011. The inclusion of Amber sites gives the promoters a way in which is contrary to the Councils own assessment and conclusions reached. We also understand that the current owners of the area known as the Spinney have already cleared a large part of the protected embankment and Spinney which goes against a Council Agreement in 2001.
Q38	Mrs Sarah Bridge [5177]		Cheswick Green cannot cope with more development
Q38	Mrs Sarah Letters [6037]		I believe that the land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge, should be omitted. Although it is described as 'low-performing' green belt, this area feels more like open countryside than the 'Arden Triangle' land, which is more surrounded by existing developments.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Sheila Cole [5940]		Rowood Drive (ref A6) Whilst I believe that the land on Rowood drive, earmarked for housing, needs to be used, I feel that by adding more housing you are exacerbating a large traffic problem. It has always been difficult to exit Rowood Drive at certain times of the day. Since the introduction of the bus lane in Lode Lane, this has become much more difficult. At times it can take 10 mins to exit the road! By building 30 houses on that site it could add 60 more cars, making the traffic problem much worse.
Q38	Mrs Stephanie Bazan [5536]		Re: Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road, Knowle (Ref: A4) I feel it is the right decision to omit the above site from the Plan as it is situated in a very important green belt area and would have a definite negative visual impact on the entrance/exit to the village. This is on top of the fact that local public services i.e. schools, doctors, highways would be totally unable to support such a large scale development
Q38	Mrs Terrina Miksom [6055]		I believe that site 413 should be omitted from the local plan as a site for residential development. My reasons are given here:- 1. It will not sit well within the landscape and we should be protecting the green belt land. 2. The high visual sensitivity from both Blue Lake Road and Knowle Wood Road. 3. Not in keeping with the character of the village or natural environment. 4. Enormous strain will be placed on local infrastructure, roads, parking, congestion.. 5. Great pressure on schools, medical services, etc. 6. Will not be sympathetic to low density development in the area
Q38	Mrs Toni Osborne [6183]		Strongly object to A5 and 413. This is high quality green belt. However 207 makes far more sense, less visual impact and close to M42 and major road access Negatively impacts 'local character' in the National Planning Policy forum. Visual Sensitivity is extremely high due to the openness of this location. Ruins visual approach from south It's an elevated prominent location, so any development will be obvious before you reach Dorridge. On a slope so greater risks of flooding With the profile of Dorridge and this location, the development would impact the overall attractiveness of Solihull Borough. Conflicts D1 policy

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]		Dorridge is one of the most sustainable settlements in the Borough in terms of public transport and local amenities. Amber site A5 Blue Lake Road should be allocated for housing.
Q38	ms Babs Gisborne [5714]		Eroding Green Belt is not in my view the best way to expand housing. There is little infrastructure in place to support the 22 dwellings, which will cause issues for both Dorridge and Hockley Heath. The road already exists but there are no pavements and currently no buses, so the new residents will be forced to use cars and further overcrowd the neighbouring roads, especially at rush hour.
Q38	Ms Jo Fuller [5381]		Amber A3 Extra pressure on roads around the site These new homes will not be creating a community, they will be the start to the degradation of the on that already exists in Dickens Heath Flood risk will rise - Less fields and more run off
Q38	Ms Kathleen O'Malley [5688]		Amber Site A6 - It is already a very congested area around Rowood drive and lode lane and will put even more pressure on traffic. The area is already very built up and the community have fewer and fewer areas to walk when we should be encouraged to walk more for our health and well being. Public health authorities are always advising to take more exercise The wildlife would be affected with a loss of their habitat. Extra pressure on the sewage system, there is a big sewer running all along one side of houses
Q38	Ms Linda Beresford [5353]		Amber Site A7 R/O 114/118 Widney Manor Road. - Would exacerbate existing congestion and highway safety issues - Would impact wildlife - Negative impact on Tree Preservation Order - Block out light from existing homes at The Spinney
Q38	Ms Rebecca Hess [5754]		Amber Site A7 - Land to the rear of 114-118 Widney Manor Road should be excluded from this consultation. Land on the opposite side of the road, adjacent to Lovelace Avenue and the farmland, copse, public right of way and public park land should also be excluded. This is important Green Belt and should be preserved - once developed it has gone forever and the nature of Solihull as a suburb with green areas and open spaces will be damaged. The wildlife will be lost. The Council should never have included the Amber omitted sites as part of this consultation.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Nic Heath [5576]		Amber site A7. Area identified as not having an 'open' character. This conflicts with findings of the Solihull Green Belt Assessment 2016, the LDF Core Strategy Assessment of Green Belt 2011 and an appeal decision relating to 114-118 Widney Manor Road. The potential inclusion of this land would not create a logical boundary, as land to the north and south on Widney Manor Road would remain in the Green Belt. No exceptional circumstances to justify changes to the Green Belt boundaries. The potential inclusion of this land would be another example of 'garden grabbing', which does not create good places.
Q38	Nicola Wells [6044]		400 houses Arden Triangle and 400 Hampton Road Thackers. The increase in population around Warwick Road/Knowle Village will be chaos/gridlock and to include Golden End Farm Ref A4 prime farm land (11 points) as an amber site (250 houses) is ridiculous. Kixley Lane is an historical old lane. Cheswick Green in the 70s and Dickens Heath in the 90s proves that Box Trees, Stratford Road Corridor is ideal for 1000/1500 homes with a new village. I object to Golden End Farm as an amber site it must stay in the Green Belt.
Q38	P T Harris [6266]		Amber site Ref A4 - Golden End Farm Would spoil the only country lane left in the village. Some consideration is required for wildlife, plants and the general wellbeing of people. Suggest looking at the many empty houses already in the Borough. Already thousands of homes built in Knowle over the last few years
Q38	Paul & Anne Wilson Ramsay [4654]		We would support the development of Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road, Knowle (Site 59), an amber parcel of land which could be developed with 250 dwellings. The site is reasonably level. There is a clearly defined boundary along Kixley Lane, Grand Union Canal and Kenilworth Road. The site is adjacent to an existing primary school and within walking distance of facilities in Knowle. Development will not affect Knowle conservation area. We would also support the development of Land off Blue Lake Road, Dorridge (Sites 104 and 413), an amber parcel of land which could be developed with 340 dwellings.
Q38	Peter & Elaine King [3262]		Blythe and Shirley. Totally object to more sites being looked into.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Peter Renwick [3507]		<p>Amber site A5 (413) should be omitted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduce urban sprawl 2. Maintain open, green belt spaces that support our pressured natural world 3. Maintain opportunities for locals to enjoy nature and the mental wellbeing which that affords 4. Retain agricultural land vital for food production 5. Reduce flooding which would be adversely affected by further increases in the built environment <p>Density of housing proposed out of keeping with existing character and development and would add to already strained local amenities and highway infrastructure. Overall, would make the area involved less desirable and attractive in every respect.</p>
Q38	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		<p>Reference A7</p> <p>It is considered that the amber site at the rear of 114 - 118 Widney Manor Road should be allocated for housing development. The analysis on which the current 'amber' status was achieved is based on some factual errors in SHELAA/Site Assessment, and errors of the analytical approach adopted in the Sustainability Appraisal. These relate to availability, and constraints on accessibility and proximity to railway. Omission of the land is unsound due to flawed justification and unlawfulness of the amalgamation approach in the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>
Q38	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>There appear to be inconsistencies in the way that the amber sites have been assessed, e.g. sites 49 and 328 were assessed as amber within the Appendix D to the report to 17th January 2019 Cabinet meeting, which agreed the document for consultation. However the Site Assessment document itself now concludes that these sites are 'green'. This should be clarified.</p>
Q38	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>There appear to be inconsistencies in the way that the amber sites have been assessed, e.g. sites 49 and 328 were assessed as amber within the Appendix D to the report to 17th January 2019 Cabinet meeting, which authorised the consultation document; however, the Site Assessment document itself now concludes that these sites are 'green'. This should be clarified.</p> <p>In terms of the site to the rear of 114 to 118 Widney Manor Road (ref A7), we would query whether there is evidence to demonstrate this site's deliverability. Instead, we would recommend the allocation of our Client's site LAND AT WIDNEY MANOR ROAD: SITE REFERENCE 407, which is available, achievable and deliverable now to bring forward affordable housing within the first five years of the draft Plan.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	There appear to be inconsistencies in the way that the amber sites have been assessed, e.g. sites 49 and 328 were assessed as amber within the Appendix D to the report to 17th January 2019 Cabinet meeting, which authorised the document for consultation. However the Site Assessment document itself now concludes that these sites are 'green'. This should be clarified.
Q38	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	There appear to be inconsistencies in the way that the amber sites have been assessed, e.g. sites 49 and 328 were assessed as amber within the Appendix D to the report to 17th January 2019 Cabinet meeting, which authorised the consultation document; however the Site Assessment document itself now concludes that these sites are 'green'. This should be clarified.
Q38	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Inconsistencies in the way that the amber sites have been assessed, e.g. sites 49 and 328 were assessed as amber within the Appendix D to the report to 17th January 2019 Cabinet meeting, which authorised the consultation document; however, the Site Assessment document itself now concludes that these sites are 'green'. This should be clarified.
Q38	Rev Sean Loone [5295]		With reference to SITE 308/205 Extreme concern and objections lodged in opposition to this for a number of reasons: Conservation - green belt area with bats, badgers etc Environmental - pollution Traffic and road safety Flooding
Q38	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Golden End Farm, Kenilworth Road, Knowle (ref A4 or site 59 in the call for sites/SHELAA) should be omitted. While the site is close to the centre of Knowle it falls within a Green Belt parcel that scores very highly (overall score 11) and would result in the village encroaching via a projection into the open countryside to the east without any form of 'rounding off'. Apart from an access from Kenilworth Road, Kixley Lane is a narrow road diminishing in width at its far end. the release of the site for housing would destroy the important approach to Knowle from the east when entering from open countryside. A combination of other smaller sites around the KDBH community could achieve 250 dwellings in a less destructive way and be better integrated into the community

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Richard Lloyd [2616]		Some of the sites designated as Amber have a lot of merit for allocation as housing sites. In particular, those on the east side of Dorridge (A5) have good accessibility to employment opportunities and public transport.
Q38	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	There is no advantage in creating and labelling sites yellow, blue and subsequently amber. This merely creates an unnecessary stage in the methodology adding to confusion and unnecessary complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them. The sites would be commented on or not under omission sites in general.
Q38	Simon Taylor [4550]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, I do not believe it is right that in all cases these sites should be omitted. - Sites 59, 104, 109, 188, 205 and 413 should all be included, as they appear to represent justifiable development opportunities. - As outlined above, to simply choose
Q38	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Support all being included. On site specifics members felt Land at Mount Dairy Farm should be subject to careful checking as to flood risk. Land at Tilehouse Lane, Whitlocks End was strongly supported for inclusion.
Q38	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		Amber Site A6 - The Rowood Drive playing field has not been utilised as a playing field for over 5 years and the site is not identified within the Council's Playing Pitch Strategy thus it is not recommended for retention. However, the Playing Pitch Strategy identifies that there are shortfalls in provision which could be remedied by improving pitch quality to alleviate overplay, reduce shortfalls and increase future provision. It is therefore considered that off site compensation will be required to mitigate for the loss of the playing field.
Q38	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Site 207 performs better than the proposed amber site of Land at Golden End Farm (Amber site A4). Both sites are adjacent to the existing settlement boundary and there are physical features bordering both sites that could create a new defensible GB boundary. We therefore do not understand how this site has been included as an amber site but our client's site has not. We seek justification for the exclusion of our client's site. Need more clarity on how sites have been assessed in the Step 2 refine criteria of the methodology.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	Steven Lyle [2914]		<p>"Amber" site A4 Golden End Farm, Knowle (Site 59) Support site being omitted. Object most strongly to site being proposed for development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Three development sites in Knowle with one between Knowle and Dorridge is an unfair imposition on Knowle and involves a 30% increase in growth. 2) Increased pressure on infrastructure and local services in Knowle, particularly traffic and parking. No evidence to explain how local services and infrastructure would cater for significantly increased demand from growth in population/traffic. 3) Destruction of high quality Green Belt land compared with lower scoring examples elsewhere in KDBH.
Q38	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>There is no advantage in creating and labelling sites yellow, blue and subsequently amber. This merely creates an unnecessary stage in the methodology adding to confusion and unnecessary complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them. The sites would be commented on or not under omission sites in general</p>
Q38	Susan Roberts [5924]		<p>Land r/o 114 to 118 Widney Manor Road (ref A7) Reference Sites 134, 205 and 308 I strongly object to the removal of these areas from the Green Belt. Site 134 was the subject of a refused Planning Application (2010/2) and the Appeal(APP/Q4625/A/10/2133554) which followed was dismissed at the Inquiry. I can see nothing which has changed to now justify the removal of these sites from the Green Belt. The embankment and wildlife corridor to the rear of site ref A7 is the subject of a Section 106 Agreement to protect it in its current state. Any development may affect this.</p>
Q38	Terry Corns [4446]		<p>I particularly object to Ref A5 & Ref 413 being included. These sites are high quality Green Belt and must be retained as such. To include these sites is unnecessary and an inappropriate intrusion into quality Green Belt which benefits the whole of the Knowle & Dorridge community Would favour development between Knowle and Solihull - where M42 already influences open space</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q38	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		Amber site A4 - Golden End Farm. The site is in a highly performing parcel of Green Belt so question why the Council should even begin to consider it for residential development. This approach indicates a lack of consistency in the consideration of which sites should or should not go forward. It is acknowledged that the site is close to Knowle village which may result in less traffic generation from new residents, although with the increased traffic flow from sites 8 and 9 there will be even more congestion along High Street and contamination from exhaust emissions.
Q38	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		Amber Site A5 - Whilst the site does not perform as highly in Green Belt terms, there will be adverse impact on local infrastructure including health, education and emergency services. There will be increased traffic flow which will impact on traffic through Knowle village.
Q38	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	There is no advantage in creating and labelling sites yellow, blue and subsequently amber. This merely creates an unnecessary stage in the methodology adding to confusion and unnecessary complexity. Delete this element of the methodology and either allocate the amber sites or reject them. The sites would be commented on or not under omission sites in general
Q38	Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss Charlotte Kirby) [2531]		It will be necessary to use most of the amber sites as most are easier to develop in the short term, being smaller sites that require less infrastructure, are more sustainable and of a lower green belt rating. However, the Blue Lake Road site (Ref. A5) and Site 59 at Kixley Road (Ref A4) should not be developed. All the other amber sites should be proposed for development which will more than compensate for the loss of the 250 dwellings of part of Site 4 west of Dickens Heath.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Omitted Sites			
Q39	Annie Lutzy [6293]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement
Q39	Arden Multi Academy Trust (mr Mark Wilson) [5910]		Representation: We consider that the Amber designation of Rowood Drive site is unjustified. We consider that there is a compelling case for the site to be included in the Local Plan Review as an allocation for residential development. This is a crucial first step in Lode Heath School's efforts to realise income from the sale of the site for housing to fund the development of an enhanced Community Sports Facility that would bring significant benefits both to the school and the wider local community. I have attached responses that have been sent to me at Lode Heath school
Q39	Arden Multi Academy Trust (mr Mark Wilson) [5910]		We consider that the Amber designation of Rowood Drive site is unjustified. We consider that there is a compelling case for the site to be included in the Local Plan Review as an allocation for residential development. This is a crucial first step in Lode Heath School's efforts to realise income from the sale of the site for housing to fund the development of an enhanced Community Sports Facility that would bring significant benefits both to the school and the wider local community. I have attached responses that have been sent to me at Lode Heath school
Q39	Arta Golestani [5527]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Balsall Common Village Residents Association (Mr Keith Tindall) [3189]		We support the fact that Grange Farm, Balsall Common site has not been selected as it is productively farmed Green Belt land with no defensible boundaries, and if selected would have left it open to urban sprawl towards Birmingham and loss of the Meriden Gap. We question why the triangle of land off the A452 between Park Lane and Lavender Hall Lane Balsall Common to be used by HS2 as a works compound for 6 years has not been chosen as a site, and believe this should be included.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Bentley Heath Church of England Primary School (Mr Andrew Williams) [2784]		Bentley Heath Church of England School has not been consulted about a plan to develop site 207 with a relocation of the school - despite what the proposer may say. The school does not endorse the proposal which will be submitted by Savills on behalf of St Philip's Land. The school has dual ownership with Birmingham Diocese and as an academy is on land leased from SMBC. It also has St James' Church within the site and a consecrated holy space. If the school were asked to expand this would be achievable on its current site.
Q39	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		Sites 76/212, coupled with brownfield Sites 31/216 should be considered for potential new settlement. A substantial proportion, after allowing for HS2, potentially available for housing, sufficient for new settlement in line with Government's garden villages and Dickens Heath. Land available that is not in narrowest part of green belt, close to employment area around Airport/NEC and within easy reach of Sprint network/Hampton rail station. Concerned that no consideration given to this option to date.
Q39	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		Site nos 76 and 212 have not been assessed for housing but, while they are in Green Belt, they are PDL and are near both Hampton and Berkswell stations. They are north of Balsall Common, within easy reach of the motorway network, and near employment opportunities. It could provide a purpose-built new settlement. Site nos 142, 198 and 233 would be an alternative to Barratt's Farm, providing the possibility of a by-pass to the west of Balsall Common. It is also more accessible to the employment opportunities. It could be developed ahead of the completion of HS2.
Q39	Bloor Homes [6243]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	Site 192 should be a 'green site'. The site performs better in some areas than Site 41 and is located in an area identified as being suitable for significant growth. The site has many benefits that outweigh the harm, arising from inappropriate development. The site has no hard constraints, limited soft constraints, and provides Solihull with an opportunity to deliver a comprehensive development in this area. The Railway line to the west of Tidbury Green could provide a new defensible boundary to the Green Belt and wider opportunities where the Green Belt wash is removed from Tidbury Green.
Q39	Carole Beattie [5601]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Catesby Estates Limited [3038]	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Site 144 north of Fillongley Road, Meriden is a deliverable option to accommodate housing. Site now covers approximately 8.33 hectares allowing a more comprehensive and developable site whilst delivering a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary to the east and west. Land is lower performing in the GBA and release would not harm purposes of the remaining green belt. Reduction in openness restricted to well-contained area close to settlement edge. Could be considered as part of larger allocation. Part of site could provide additional educational development/improvements. Existing green infrastructure within and surrounding could be enhanced.
Q39	Catesby Estates Limited [3038]	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	Site 20 south of Hampton Lane, Solihull is a deliverable option to accommodate additional housing. Significantly larger site now being promoted covering approximately 13.69ha. The land constitutes a comprehensive and developable site in an area of lower performing green belt that would provide a strong and defensible Green Belt boundary with established woodland to the east and south. Would not harm purposes of remaining land in green belt, and reduction in openness restricted to well-contained area closely related to settlement edge.
Q39	CGA Taylor [4250]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Christopher Read [6267]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Christopher Fellows [6118]		<p>Call for Sites 233: land NW of Balsall Common well-suited for development, if west side of village favoured for expansion, to reduce construction traffic through village. Sustainability Appraisal only has one more negative than positive effects, land moderately performing in Green Belt Assessment, and defensible green belt boundaries could be provided in form of drainage swales/bunds. Equidistant to economic assets to sites on eastern side.</p> <p>Site 82: land at Kenilworth Road is suitable, yet also priority 6 and rated red. Error in commentary on SA, whilst reference to no defensible green belt boundary is inaccurate, as woodland to SW and part NW.</p> <p>Site 421: Silver Tree Farm, Balsall Street also priority 6 and rated red, but could be part of larger site with Sites 233/198 and has well established field boundary to NW.</p> <p>Site 422: Rose Bank, Balsall Street has Step 1 priority 5, and identified as suitable as windfall, so should be rated green/amber, not red. Existing green belt boundary not defensible, lower performing in GBA and stands inclusion as smaller site.</p>
Q39	Councillor Chris Williams [2087]		<p>Site 53 Agree that Bluebell Recreation Ground is unsuitable for development. It's a popular local park and other land is already being lost to HS2 nearby.</p> <p>Site 221 Agree that the Onward Club green space is unsuitable for development, as it's a recreational area used for sports.</p> <p>Site 225 Needs redevelopment to make better use of space.</p> <p>Site 54 strongly agree that this green space is well used recreational space of significant value. It was donated philanthropically to the predecessor local authority to be used for recreational activity. Concerned that there could be some development at the bottom part of the site, behind the Family Tree Club on Clopton Crescent. A Council depot was placed on this land in the past despite there being a Covenant on all of the playing field. Returning this land to green space would return the land to its original use.</p> <p>Site 56 Agree this site is unviable and not sensible to develop. Most of it is already well developed with popular, socially-rented bungalows and a Public House that has received recent investment.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Whilst this is a necessary question, I envisage only developers will respond. The reason being, the site assessment document is separate. It is some 674 pages long. It is an unrealistic ask for residents to contribute, except on sites they have already become aware of. Even then, the likelihood of them finding the exact site is low.
Q39	David Acton [3396]		Site 88: Widney Manor Road, Bentley Heath should be allocated, as: 1.Existing Built Up Area at nearest to Site, is at corner of Widney Road/Four Ashes Road, only 50 yards away. 2.Site would have clear/well defined/substantial/permanent/immoveable physical boundaries which would stop it being a precedent, eg. Widney Manor Road, the Cemetery which adjoins site, railway line, M42. 3.Would not erode green belt gap, as merely infilling in established settlement of existing properties built many years ago. 4.Has very high accessibility with bus services/rail station, no redeeming or worthwhile landscape features. 5.SA flawed as site contains 8/10 of most important elements 6.Comparable with allocated Sites 8 and 9, and amber site 134. 7.Supported by SHELAA as achievable.
Q39	David Osborne [5891]		Site 207 (Land bounded by Brown's Lane, Smiths Lane and Widney Manor Road) makes far more sense (than Amber site A5). Closer to M42 and major road access and much lower visual impact.
Q39	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	We strongly object to the way in which Site 209 has been assessed in the site selection process for the reasons which are set out below - and on that basis, object to the inconsistent application of the methodology. see detail in letter
Q39	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	We strongly object to the way in which Site 426 has been assessed in the site selection process see letter for detail
Q39	Dominique McGarry [4414]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Dr Christine West [5726]		Red sites 76 and 212 Cornets End Quarry site needs to be considered. This would be preferable to invading so much of the Green Belt surrounding Balsall Common. Andy Street has set aside large funds to allow this sort of project. Red site 233 Grange Farm There would be good access to the A452.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Dr Lucy Hillman [6184]		There are alternative sites between Knowle and Solihull which would be far better served locally if developed rather than green belt land in Knowle and Dorridge. The access to the M42 easier, access to more parking, larger shopping facilities, schools, more surgeries, employment opportunities, public transport links etc and better infrastructure surrounding for e.g.red Site 207 would be a far better site to develop than the green belt land of Knowle.
Q39	Dr Paul Rylah [5503]		It's not clear to me if the area north of Hockley Heath, bordering and south of the M42 between junctions 4 and 5, comes under this section. If so then I object to the omission of this site for development. It would cause the least disruption and traffic congestion in comparison to nearby earmarked development sites around Hockley Heath, Knowle and Dorridge , is extensive enough that it can be developed whilst still maintaining the "Solihull Gap", offers close transport links to Solihull, Birmingham and beyond, and would have the least impact on nearby settlements. It's a no brainer!
Q39	Duchy Homes Ltd [6036]	Barton Willmore Planning (Miss Hiteshree Kundalia) [6035]	Yes, we consider our Client's Site (Site 1) should be reassessed as a 'green' site in light of the information we have provided in response to question 2. Related to this, the relocation of the village hall from Site 1 to Site 2 should also be assessed as suitable for inclusion within the draft Plan to facilitate this.
Q39	Eileen Lamb [5709]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Ella McGarry [4246]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement
Q39	Ferdous Gossain [5606]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Francoise Read [6268]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Site 338-Land adj Harpers Field, Balsall Common</p> <p>Other sites appear to be reliant on delivery of HS2 or the Bypass.</p> <p>Site 3 would stretch much further south and have greater impact on Green Belt.</p> <p>Site 338 only fails on the lack of defensible Green Belt boundaries to the south and west. This is disputed.</p> <p>The site is no further from the centre than the sites allocated in the 2013 Local Plan.</p> <p>Site assessment is incorrect as there is a footpath alongside the site.</p> <p>Green Belt Assessment conclusions are disputed as the site context has changed.</p> <p>Site easy to deliver.</p>
Q39	Geoff Osborne [5991]		<p>Site 207 would make far more sense than Amber site A5 (Land off Blue Lake Rd) due to access to Solihull town, M42 A34 etc thereby reducing traffic from more existing congested area.</p>
Q39	Gill Corns [4448]		<p>Alternative sites in the "gap" between Knowle & Solihull would be preferable to both the major proposed sites to the north and south of Knowle centre. Access to transport links, the M42 and employment areas would be far superior and have a less damaging effect upon transport, congestion, parking & the quality of life for existing residents in Knowle & Dorridge. For example, the "Red" site ref 207 (land bounded by Browns Lane, Smiths Lane & Widney Manor Road) would be more suitable than the land south of Knowle thus avoiding unnecessary intrusion into the Green belt.</p>
Q39	Gillian Griggs [3964]		<p>The Council should review its assessment of sites as there are inconsistencies in the assessment of several sites. Examples in KDBH include 244, 323, 324 and 413, but also small sites such as 207, 210, 344 and 135. Some of these perform well on a number of criteria and may be able to overcome concerns such as defensible GB boundaries. A mix of large and smaller sites in a more dispersed pattern would have less impact on the GB, be more consistent with government guidance and potentially being less damaging to village character and infrastructure.</p>
Q39	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Sites 16 and 17 land south of Hampton Lane and west of Ravenshaw Lane/south of Hampton Lane should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing, or safeguarded for future needs. Sites are suitable, constraint free and deliverable. Conform with strategy to focus development in and around Solihull town centre. Lower performing green belt parcels supported by Sustainability Appraisal in landscape area capable of accommodating development. Site assessment reference to coalescence misleading as GBA indicates little contribution towards Purpose 2. Accessible to facilities and public transport.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (John Pearce) [6261]	Call for Sites reference 418 Diddington Lane HiA should be allocated as within main settlement capable of accommodating new development. Site 6 has uncertain delivery, whereas Site 418 available and can contribute to early Plan period needs. Capacity has flexibility to meet wide range of needs depending on Plan target, and could be phased over Plan periods. Will deliver market and affordable housing, accommodate public open space and well-located to village centre, shops, school, surgery, PH, and railway station. New pedestrian and cycle links will increase permeability. HS2 line will provide strong defensible green belt boundary.
Q39	IM Land [3900]	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs Rachel Best) [2448]	Site 420 north of Main Road, Meriden should be allocated for up to 100 houses. Site Selection topic paper demonstrates Meriden has good level of services and is highly accessible. Suitable for limited expansion and could take more than 100 dwellings. Site Assessment scores well other than defensible boundaries, which is capable of remedy using existing hedgerows/watercourse. Accessibility Mapping finds very high level of accessibility. Maximum SHELAA score. Moderate impact on green belt. Visually well-contained. Can provide significant green infrastructure. Site performs well against Step 2 factors, other than very low landscape capacity, which applies to Site 10 and elsewhere. Site more positive in SA than other Meriden sites. Assessment incorrectly states 170 rather than 100 dwellings. SHELAA Site 141 should be further considered for allocation.
Q39	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Fiona Lee-McQueen) [6265]	It can be included within the opportunity area 'South of Birmingham' a broad, non-specific area of land between Birmingham and Stratford upon Avon (location NS5) which was identified as having potential for a new settlement in the GL Hearn Strategic Growth Study 2018. Q02 is flawed and Site should have been considered to Step 2 due to proximity to Earlswood Station. Could provide up to 500 homes, provide Green Belt compensation, provide 11 ha of open space, provide opportunity for supported uses such as schools, adjacent to underutilised station.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	IM Properties [279]	Marrons Planning (Daniel Robinson-Wells) [6202]	Red site 62: Land Adjacent Shirley Golf Course. This Priority 5 site in the council's site hierarchy should be identified as a 'green site', as the assessment for Site 62 does not support the Step 2 refinement from potential allocation to a site with significant harmful impacts. There are no significant impacts on the green belt, as the gap between settlements would not be reduced and is much greater than maintained from other allocations, or on landscape character, as other sites allocated in the same LCA Area and there is no finer-grained assessment. Site should be categorised as high accessibility rather than medium/high, as footway can be provided and Accessibility Mapping score of 40 is incorrect, should be 100. Site has a strong defensible boundary with the golf course to the south.
Q39	Jean Kelly [5684]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Jeanette McGarry [4247]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Jeanette McGarry [4247]		SMBC should look seriously at proposal to build a new settlement north of Balsall Common, as an alternative to imposing significant new housing in Balsall Common itself, which is already at capacity.
Q39	John Haynes [5927]		The council should consider building on site numbers 76 and 212 at Cornets End Lane (section 15 and Paragraph 405) as opposed to Site 1 (Barratt's Farm).
Q39	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	- Two red sites should be upgraded to amber and arguably green: Site 135 (land at Dorridge Road, Dorridge) and Site 107 (Land at Gentleshaw Lane, Knowle). - Site 135: Council's main constraint is the site's lack of strong Green Belt boundary raising conc
Q39	Kier Living Ltd [5867]		Site 341 should be re-assessed as green and allocated in Plan for housing. Evidence in Green Belt Assessment, SHELAA, Sustainability Appraisal and Site Assessment indicates site performs very well and only rejected as would narrow green belt gap between Marston Green and Chelmsley Wood, though this conflicts with GBA and site assessment. Site deliverable within 5 years, will off-set shortfall on adjoining site, and would provide policy compliant housing mix, open space and overlooking of linear park.
Q39	Knight Frank (Mr Tom Stanley) [6051]	Knight Frank (Mr Tom Stanley) [6051]	Representation made by Knight Frank on behalf of Orchard Care Ltd in relation to the site at land between 39 and 79 Earlswood Road (Draft Local Plan Site Ref: 210), promoting the site for inclusion in the plan for a care home development.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Forum (Mrs Jane Aykroyd) [2356]		The Council should review its site assessments as there are inconsistencies regarding several sites. Examples in KDBH include sites within Arden Triangle, Site 213, Site 244, but also smaller sites. Some of these perform well on a number of criteria, and some of the concerns may be able to be overcome. A mix of large and smaller sites in a more dispersed pattern would have less impact on the Green Belt, be more consistent with government guidance and potentially be less damaging to village character and infrastructure.
Q39	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Based on the inconsistency with the site selection assessment of sites that has been demonstrated fully within the Landscape and Visual Statements (Appendix 2) it is considered that Land at Bickenhill Road, Marston Green in accordance with the Council's own assessment site should be at least an Amber, if not a Green site.
Q39	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Based on the inconsistency with the site selection assessment of sites that has been demonstrated fully within the Landscape and Visual Statements (Appendix 2) it is considered that site 195 Land at Damson Parkway should be included as an Amber site if not a Green site, particularly given the neighbouring sites to the south of the Grand Union Canal have been included as a Proposed Housing allocation - Site 16 for development of up to 600 dwellings.
Q39	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Based on the inconsistency with the site selection assessment of sites that has been demonstrated fully within the Landscape and Visual Statements (Appendix 2) it is considered that site 199 Land at Four Ashes Road should be included as a Green or Amber site.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	L&Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates) [4343]	Pegasus Group (Mrs Michelle Simpson-Gallego) [5608]	Based on the inconsistency with the site selection assessment of sites that has been demonstrated fully within the Landscape and Visual Statements (Appendix 2) it is considered that there are three sites that should be removed from being assessed as Red sites and moved into Amber, including Site 197 land at Berkswell Road, Meriden. Utilising this site would enable a less intensive scheme more in keeping with a semi-rural settlement on Site 10, and spread development on smaller scale sites.
Q39	L&Q Estates and Barratt David Wilson Homes [6223]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Tim Collard) [5316]	we are firmly of the view that the Grange Farm, Balsall Common site should be allocated for development and that the available technical evidence demonstrates that this is the case. We take no issue with the Council's over-arching strategy of seeking to focus growth, first and foremost, on land beyond the Green Belt. We also take no issue with the Council's acknowledgement that of the Growth Options commented on previously, Option A (High Frequency Public Transport Corridors and Hubs) - including around Balsall Common), offers considerable potential to deliver sustainable growth.
Q39	Landowner Winterton Farm [5795]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	Site 173 has been incorrectly assessed and should have been identified as a Priority 6 site under Step 1 of the site selection process. The site is within a moderately performing GB parcel and is adjacent to the sustainable settlement of Cheswick Green. The land also performs more highly than Site 26 in the Site Assessment (January 2019) document. We request that our client's land is correctly reassessed and either the whole site or parts of the site are allocated for residential development.
Q39	Laura Emma Johnson [5723]		Object to development on red site 110 From the canal you see a beautiful landscape on the edge of the village. This wonderful beauty would be lost if houses were built here. It would result in losing the real village character you experience as you approach knowle and the church from the Kenilworth Road. Loss of landscape. Loss of character. Loss of wildlife.
Q39	Laura Emma Johnson [5723]		Object to development on red site 98 Loss to landscape Loss of character Loss to wildlife

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	M Ian Birch [5461]		<p>Call for site ref: 54</p> <p>Near to our properties there is a piece of land where Solihull Council is seeking to sell to developers to build houses.</p> <p>I would suggest many local residents would seek your intervention on this subject and any small open green spaces being built on for future ghettos.</p>
Q39	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Oak Farm (site 24) allocation should include the full extent of the original submission (Site Ref 136).</p> <p>The Boundary of the site would make a firmer and more defensible Green Belt Boundary than that currently identified. Roads have been identified as defensible boundaries on other sites; this is no different.</p> <p>The omitted land makes little contribution to landscape quality or the purposes of the Green Belt.</p> <p>From the traffic island on the eastern edge of the village, the site is clearly part of the settlement; Friday Lane being the visual boundary between the settlement and open countryside.</p>
Q39	Miss Lyndsey Hawkes [5376]		<p>CFS 54. Clopton Cres.</p> <p>Development will cause pressure on local amenities, loss of playing fields will impact local children, increase of cars will increase traffic congestion.</p> <p>I feel that the houses will not be built in the interests of the community.</p>
Q39	Mr Peter Heeks [5864]		<p>Grass cutting compound site 54. Agree it should be omitted from any proposed development. It should be grassed and returned to its original state.</p>
Q39	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Site 21, which is part of Site 2, and Site 96 represent viable and reasonable site and should not be identified as red sites. Site is gap between houses close to development within Catherine de Barnes to east, with bus route to Solihull. Sites in close proximity, notably 147/230/339 and allocated Site 24 are assessed as green and Sites 21/2/96 compare positively. Very limited contribution to green belt as part of lower performing parcel compared to Site 24, and would not lead to coalescence. Sustainable location, no constraints, deliverable and disputed that there are severe/widespread impacts not outweighed by benefits.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mr & Mrs J King [3916]	PRW Strategic Advice (Paul Watson) [3914]	<p>CFS 69- relatively close to the Birmingham-Stratford rail line & stations and local services, is underused, includes a vacant house and commercial buildings, is shielded from wider views by trees and by existing development in Norton Lane and Rumbush Lane and is capable of an immediate start.</p> <p>Site is well placed to provide a much needed boost to housing land supply with no significant detriment to strategic Green Belt functions, support public transport provision in the area and contribute appropriately to necessary funding for the development of the proposed Earlswood Living Landscape.</p>
Q39	Mr & Mrs Williams [6253]	Oakwood Planning Ltd (Mrs Jayne Cashmore) [5447]	<p>Site 127 Grange Road, Dorridge should be Green as incorrectly appraised in Q02.</p> <p>Step 1. Should be higher priority 3/5 rather than 9 as partly brownfield, and assessed as medium accessibility. Should be medium/high accessibility based on Accessibility Study as should be 80 for accessibility to train services. As a high performing site, more significant harmful impacts required in Step 2 to exclude.</p> <p>Step 2. SHELAA should be Category 1 as suitability score of at least 43, and agricultural land should be 5. Accessibility not part of refinement and already found accessible. Breaching green belt boundary not a conclusive factor as majority of sites allocated do similarly. Site has clear physical boundaries that could form defensible green belt boundary without opening up adjoining land. Least harmful site within lower performing green belt parcel. LCA capacity a guide only and accepts likely to be able to accommodate small areas of new development.</p> <p>SA has 4 positive and 3 not 4 negative effects. Site not accurately reflected by amalgamated site AECOM58 scores. Should be 6 positive and only 2 negative impacts. SA4 should be positive as site contains no agricultural land. SA9 should be neutral as Site not affected by LWS. sa16 should show significant positive effect</p>
Q39	Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]		<p>I understand that there is a proposal to build a new settlement to the north of Balsall Common and I would urge the council to seriously look at that as an alternative to imposing any significant level of new housing on Balsall Common, a village which is already clearly "bursting at the seams".</p>
Q39	Mr Andrew Freeman [2925]		<p>There are no red sites in Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath that should be included as housing allocations.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mr Anthony Baines [5764]		Site 207 would be a much better option to Site 431 in our view as it would be much more in keeping with that particular area and it also provides much better access to Solihull , the motorway and other major roads.
Q39	Mr Antony Cooper [6017]		<p>Site 413 and Site 207 Believes level of development in KDBH is excessive without further amber or red sites because of excessive congestion which will occur, inadequate roads leading to road safety issues, increased strain on local services and the developments being out of character with the existing built environments.</p> <p>It is difficult to understand why site 413 is amber and site 207 is red. 207 has greater separation, is more in line with the KDBH Neighbourhood Plan, is more in keeping with the character of the surrounding area and has better and easier access to Solihull Town Centre.</p>
Q39	Mr Ashley Canning [5377]		<p>CFS 54. Clopton Cres. Development will cause pressure on local amenities, loss of playing fields will impact local children, increase of cars will increase traffic congestion.</p> <p>I feel that the houses will not be built in the interests of the community.</p>
Q39	Mr Bob Holtham [3530]		<p>In the KDBH area there are a number of alternative locations for development which appear to have been excluded on marginal/subjective grounds which could take some of the pressure brought about by the other Knowle sites. SUPPORT: Site 207, Accessible to Solihull, the railway and Stratford Road and capable of providing good housing numbers on a large featureless site with a strong defensible boundary. The 'gap' between Solihull and KDBH would not be harmed because of the existing River Blythe/M42 corridor and there would be a much needed new primary school. SUPPORT: Sites 72,419,88,108 for similar reasons.</p>
Q39	Mr Brian Hillman [6003]		<p>Yes I believe that development should be concentrated to the north of Knowle/Dorridge particularly no. 207 Smiths Lane/Widney Manor Road. Other sites in the 'gap' between Knowle & Solihull would give easier access to transport links, M42 and would be far less damaging in the way of transport congestion, parking and the infrastructure and quality of life for existing residents in Knowle & Dorridge and would preserve the Green Belt on the proposed Site 9 and the amber site Ref A5 & Ref 413. The Green Belt should not be down graded for development as it destroys the historic settlement.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mr C Gledhill [4812]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mr D Deanshaw [2226]		Red Sites 82, 142, 198, 233, 421 Grange Farm, Balsall Common Grange Farm and adjoining land would enable provision of relocated housing from Sites 2 and 22, together with new/relocated Primary School away from B4101 traffic and not affected by HS2 or phasing restrictions.
Q39	Mr D Edmonds [4808]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mr D Perks [3399]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mr David Carter [5404]		Red site 423 Any housing development here would have a significant negative impact I am alarmed that developers have apparently bought part of this land (near Lovelace) and are hoping to build houses on this land. My fellow residents are totally against any such development, and expect the Council to refuse any planning application.
Q39	Mr David Davies [6270]		Red Site ref 56- Clopton Crescent Green Space should not be used to build more houses. Additional development will result in more traffic, increased congestion and delays as well as being unsafe for children to walk to school. Property values will reduce
Q39	Mr David Power [5941]		Sites in the "gap" between Knowle & Solihull would be preferable to the proposed sites north and south of Knowle centre. Access to transport links, the M42 and employment would be far better and have significantly less impact on parking, congestion, and quality of life for residents in Knowle & Dorridge. The "Red" site ref 207 (land bounded by Browns Lane, Smiths Lane & Widney Manor Road) would be more suitable than the land south of Knowle and avoid destruction of Green belt.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mr Don Grantham [5489]		Alternative sites between Knowle & Solihull would be much preferable to both the major proposed sites to the north and south of Knowle centre. Access to the M42, transport links, and employment areas would be significantly superior and have a much less damaging, effect upon transport, congestion, parking & the quality of life for existing residents in Knowle & Dorridge. An example being, the "Red" site ref 207 (land bounded by Browns Lane, Smiths Lane & Widney Manor Road) being much more suitable than the land south of Knowle - this would avoid unnecessary intrusion into the Green belt.
Q39	Mr G Frost [4809]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement
Q39	Mr Geoffrey Onyett [5901]		The impact of site 207 in comparison to site 413 is much less harmful to the locality and would be more in keeping with the KNBH Neighbourhood Plan.
Q39	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		Sites 142/233 Grange Farm Balsall Common are discounted. The combined capacity of these sites is 2698. Although in the Green Belt and should be protected, they are not in the Meriden Gap and therefore should not be considered as performing as highly as Barrett's Farm which is in the Meriden Gap. These sites on average are no further from the station than extreme parts of Barrett's Farm. Along with the Trevallion Stud, these could provide support for a western bypass which would be far preferable to the one proposed. Why are sites 76/412 Berkswell Quarry assessed for employment only?
Q39	Mr Glenn Woolley [5767]		objection of development of site 54 at Clopton Crescent site should remain as a depot or be used as green space
Q39	Mr Gregory Lowson [5960]		Red site 207 would involve no destruction of green belt; would create housing nearer to the sources of employment and thus save travel time; emissions and the traffic chaos that will entail if the arden triange or amber site Re A5 and 413 are developed.
Q39	Mr H Keene [4806]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mr Ian Rees [5271]		CFS 53 - We have seen a constant erosion of the open grassed areas in Chelmsley Wood. I have copies of documents from the Land Registry relating to the area subject of the house building proposals - stating that the land is under a covenant for the use of public open space. Why was there no consultation of local residents during the covenants removal? I would strongly object to the potential loss of the Family Tree Social Club. We have few enough local amenities. I'm aware of the national housing shortage and the need to build new homes

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mr J Allen [4072]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Paul Harris) [4070]	Site 5 land at Grove Farm Knowle should be included. Site performs well in the SHELAA and Green Belt Assessment and SA is too broad and fails to recognise site specifics of this land.
Q39	Mr J Davies [2104]		Sites around Meriden. This area can be developed instead of Shirley, for example, as it would benefit from the more than adequate road network and draw road use and services use away from the already crowded areas elsewhere in the plan.
Q39	Mr J Stanley [4786]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mr James Hamilton [6038]		There are alternative sites for building rather than narrowing the gap at this point (near site 1/Meriden Gap) Section 15 and Paragraph 405 for example show Sites - No.76 and No.212 at Cornets End Lane which could provide a new settlement without narrowing down the Meriden Gap.
Q39	Mr John Hornby [5851]		I believe that the proposed level of development in the KDBH area is excessive without admitting any Amber or Red sites as Allocated Sites. However, the relative assessment of Site 413 (Amber) against Site 207 (Red) is very difficult to understand on an objective basis. My detailed representation sets out clear and objective grounds to rank Site 207 well ahead of Site 413 as a candidate for development.
Q39	Mr John Tocker [5470]		Call for sites ref: 54 Residents feel this land should be restored to its original use. This very small pocket of open green space is part of the gateway to North Solihull. I am convinced many might conclude a perception not conclusive to our future prosperity, major developments or investments.
Q39	Mr K R Baker [2041]		I think that the inclusion of CFS 32 Chadwick End would address the lack of varied housing types in the village. It would allow for a significant contribution of social housing/custom/self-build, and could include a shop/community centre/village green.
Q39	Mr M Trentham [2114]		I recommend that the proposed Oldway Drive Area be removed from the Green Belt as part of the review of washed over areas, and therefore that Site 107 - Land at Gentleshaw Lane - be changed from Red to Green. Site 107 has never before been assessed as part of a wider area, already containing c200 dwellings, to be removed from the Green Belt.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mr Mark Thompson [5870]		Red Site 54 - grass compound. Objection to any development on the green land adjacent to Newby Grove and land occupied by 'The Family Tree' Social Club and the grass cutting compound to the rear.
Q39	Mr Martin Archer [3315]		I believe that Red site 207 ie the area bounded by Browns Lane , Smiths Lane and Widney Manor Road should be considered for development.I think it would be preferable to build on land near to the M42 than take large quantities of Green Belt Land adjacent to Knowle and Dorridge although i accept the benefits of developing Arden School and providing some additional housing on the northern part of the Arden triangle
Q39	Mr Neil Murphy [5187]		- CFS 325 provides a suitable and sustainable location for urban extension to Hampton Lane without encroaching on Catherine De Barnes and therefore would not contribute to coalescence. - The site is located within a lower performing parcel in the Green
Q39	Mr P Greasley [4813]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mr Paul Salamon [5509]		Site 207 adjacent to motorway would be suitable location with good road network able to take more traffic. Also residents would have choice not to use cars due to closeness to Solihull and the motorway already acts as a divide between Solihull and Knowle/Dorridge . With area already having motorway noise , housing sited close does not make any difference to the locality.
Q39	Mr Phil Barnett [5644]		Further sites should be released to make essential infrastructure requirements affordable. Through the extension of an allocation to sites 13, 121, 219, 417, 38, 416, 180, 208, and 145 a defensible barrier can be formed by the roads of Stratford Road, Kineton Lane and School Road (supported by the canal). The extension of such allocation would provide a connection with the Blythe Valley development and provide significant investment in infrastructure from a major development and would provide safe access from a main artery road of the A3400 from the M42 junction 4.
Q39	Mr R A Smith [4782]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mr R Hill [5374]		CFS 54 - Clopton Crescent Depot & British Legion Club Council have closes 6 schools in the area and built houses on the sites All green spaces are being built on, no matter then size - there are no areas for children to play Traffic is gridlocked
Q39	Mr Ray Painter [5439]		Call for sites ref: 54 I would like to make you aware of my concerns regarding the proposed development of the green space adjacent to our properties Newby Grove/Clopton Crescent.
Q39	Mr Stephen Deehan [5931]		Objection to site 180 being classifred as a red site. A number of recent developments in the vicinity have been granted planning permission. Sites 139, 176, 328 and 49 are green and between 50 - 200m from site 180. They are also in the Green Belt and it is not unreasonable for site 180 to be included in this category. Visibility splays are appropriate, existing service mains and sewers are available and stormwater can be attenuated.
Q39	Mr Steven Rushton [3211]		This version of the plan seems to prioritise development of large scale new / green belt sites rather than more sensitive localised developments in and around existing developed areas. Whilst I'm sure this is the preference for property development companies (they can maximise profit per square metre) I really don't feel this is in the long term interests of the region from an economic, aesthetic nor practical perspective.
Q39	Mr T N Walton [4817]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mr T Thomas [2538]		When the next LDP consultation takes place in under 15 years more land will be needed and should be taken into account in developing this plan. Current Amber and Red sites should be reconsidered in the light of this rather than the current short term view.
Q39	Mr Tony Mann [5612]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mr Tony Moon [4964]		I think that smaller more spread for the sites would maintain the overall feel of the village

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mr. Andreas Welzel [3137]		I support inclusion of Site reference 84. Currently this is unused wasteland and an eyesore. In 2018 planning application was already granted for 2 4-bed bungalows on the east end of the site. So it would make sense to include the entire strip for housing, ideally Self build/ custom build. It would then join a larger more coherent area with the west of Dickens Heath site and the (currently amber) site Land r/o 146 to 152 Tilehouse Lane.
Q39	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	Red Site 14: 2440 Stratford Road/Firs Paddock fully satisfies site selection criteria and should be green and allocated. No known constraints preventing redevelopment of this partly brownfield site. Site is in sustainable location, part of built up area of settlement and requires only a minor adjustment to Green Belt boundary. Lower performing in GBA and medium to high accessibility. Object to erroneous application of Q02 Step 1 as should be 3/5 not 6, and Step 2 criteria satisfied. Object to statement re lack of defensible boundary as provided by mature trees/hedgerows. Lack of local opposition to site.
Q39	Mrs E A Seal [4814]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs J Bliss [4803]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs B Hill [5375]		CFS 54 Clopton Crescent Depot & British Legion Club objection to further development on open green space in North Solihull and Existing Facilities are over crowded ,schools and doctors, lack of children's play space, traffic gridlock.
Q39	Mrs B Stanley [4785]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement
Q39	Mrs C Cavigan [4810]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs C S Prence [5796]		CFS 56 - Delighted that this site has been marked as a red site
Q39	Mrs Claire Hill [5417]		The red sites No. 98 and No, 110 should be omitted as these are very ancient fields. The site at No.98 is actually a medieval ridge and furrow field and should therefore very definitely not be built on. It is part of Knowle heritage. There would also be the added problem with both of these sites with regard to traffic - on one side by the Kenilworth Road and on the other by the Warwick Road - both of these are main roads which are extremely busy at all times of the day and could not facilitate any extra traffic.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Grange Farm, Balsall Common (Sites 142, 198 & 233) Grange Farm is not included at all and I feel that this is a much better option and the land is also owned by a sole developer. I do not know why the green points for this area are not better than Barratt's Farm.
Q39	Mrs Diane Thornton [3107]		The council has asked for alternative sites, if being near a station, as suggested for Site 4, is all that is required, have the fields to the east of Widney Manor Station been considered. Widney Manor Station is much better linked.
Q39	Mrs E Hedley [3516]		A mix of sites and a more dispersed pattern of development would be far less damaging to the Green Belt, have far less impact upon the infrastructure and be much more acceptable to residents. Sites 72, 107, 135, 207, 210, 244, and 344 seem to perform reasonably well but have been categorised as red, although it is not clear why.
Q39	Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [6162]		I support the response made by the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum
Q39	Mrs Elizabeth Hulse [6162]		I support the submission made by the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum
Q39	Mrs Elspeth Hamilton [5052]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		Why have sites 76 and 212 not been assessed for housing? Although they are in Green Belt, they are PDL and are near both Hampton and Berkswell stations. They are within easy reach of the motorway network. These could provide a purpose-built new settlement. Sites 142, 198 and 233 could provide an alternative to Barratt's Farm and facilitate a by-pass to the west of Balsall Common. The site assessment has very similar attributes to site 1. It would provide a better site for a new primary school and could be developed ahead of the completion of HS2
Q39	Mrs Helen Baker [5930]		Alternative sites in the "gap" between Knowle & Solihull would be preferable to both the major proposed sites to the north and south of Knowle centre. Access to transport links, the M42 and employment areas would be far superior and have a less damaging, effect upon transport, congestion, parking & the quality of life for existing residents in Knowle & Dorridge. For example, the "Red" site ref 207 (land bounded by Browns Lane, Smiths Lane & Widney Manor Road) would be more suitable than the land south of Knowle thus avoiding unnecessary intrusion into the Green belt
Q39	Mrs J A Gledhill [4811]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mrs J Carpenter [4796]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs J E Smith [4781]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs Jennifer K Darby [6284]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs Jill Hillman [5492]		Site No. 207 Smiths Lane/Widney Manor Road and other alternative sites in the gap between Knowle & Solihull and around the M42. This would be preferable to proposed sites in Knowle. Access for transport links and the M42 motorway would be easier and have a less damaging effect on the infrastructure, congestion of Knowle/Dorridge village, car parking, dr's and dentist surgeries, nursery and school places. Give consideration to smaller dispersed sites that would not have such huge impact on heritage and infrastructure of existing residential areas. These could be built a lot quicker and be better for future occupiers.
Q39	Mrs Jill Hillman [5492]		Use alternative sites in the gap between Knowle & Solihull which would be preferable to both of the major proposed sites to the north and south of Knowle Centre. Access for transport links and the M42 motorway would be far easier and have a less damaging effect on the infrastructure, congestion of Knowle/Dorridge village, car parking, dr's and dentist surgeries, nursery and school places in the Knowle & Dorridge community. Red site 207 would be better option aswell areas north of Knowle around the M42 would give clear access to transport & commuter routes out without affecting Knowle Dorridge.
Q39	Mrs K Drakes [4793]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement
Q39	Mrs Kealie Ahmad [6155]		Re-assess site 48, Earlsmere House (in isolation or together with others sites in the same location) taking account of current committed developments in the area and now Amber proposed. All are huge and have a massive impact on the openness of the greenbelt. Accessibility assessment is incorrect -Site is closer to the GP surgery, food store, transport, than most on Cheswick Green and Blythe Valley. Landscape sensitivity assessment is inconsistent. Extensive traveler sites, resulting in land taken out of greenbelt not even mentioned in landscape assessment. The site falls within spatial strategy plans. Councils assessment is dishonest.
Q39	Mrs L Keene [4800]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Mrs Leslie Eustace [4792]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs Lyn Holtham [6015]		The Council should consider the allocation of further sites away from Knowle village where accessibility to Widney Manor Station, Solihull and Stratford Road and the M-ways would be easier. For instance, Smiths Lane/Widney Manor Rd. Bentley Heath, Earlswood Road Dorridge and Kixley Lane Knowle.
Q39	Mrs M Edmonds [4804]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs P Green [4790]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs Rita Perks [4805]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]		Call for Sites 76 and 212 at Berkswell Quarry should be properly assessed as a suitable response to the Strategic Growth Study, as the location is accessible to <u>main employment centres to the north.</u>
Q39	Mrs Yichae Doh [6187]		Please include the land south of Houndsfield Lane (reference 84). I believe this is perfect for self-build. We registered on the Right to build register and building our own home on this land we could free up our space on the register. Last year planning permission for two dormer bungalows was granted for the east end of this site, where previously there was only a small dilapidated workshop. Following this precedence, I believe it is preferable to include the land in the local plan to help enabling a more orderly development, rather than having the owners press individually for permission.
Q39	Ms Anne Stewart [5464]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Ms Jennifer Cayley [5598]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Ms Joanne Bellamy [5599]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Ms Kat Mann [5614]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Nurton Developments [5856]	Chave Planning (Ms Caroline Chave) [2678]	Nurton Developments considers that the correct site (Site 25) has been chosen for allocation at Hockley Heath and none of the red sites at Hockley Heath should be included for allocation. Detailed reasons why each of the other sites (site 13/121, 14, 38, 57, 120, 145, 180, 208, 416 and 417) should not be viewed favourably is summarized in the full text representation.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Packington Estate Enterprises Ltd [400]	Arcadis (Mr Will Charlton) [3646]	Further land within Meriden should be allocated for housing as village and facilities could accommodate additional numbers. Site 128 Area G Meriden, currently being quarried, could assist in additional housing and should be considered in part or full as logical extension to Site 10. Would enable a gateway development into Meriden from Birmingham Road/Maxstoke Lane roundabout and high quality reclamation of benefit to village. Would form logical and defensible boundary to western end of village.
Q39	Paul J Dufrane [4410]		The council has asked for alternative sites, if being near a station is a requirement, have the fields to the east of Widney Manor Station been considered. Widney Manor Station is much better linked.
Q39	Paula Haynes [5922]		Instead of Green Belt land at Barratt's Farm, the council should consider building on site numbers 76 and 212 at Cornets End Lane (section 15 and Paragraph 405)
Q39	Peter Renwick [3507]		I do not support inclusion of Red Sites - the proposed level of development on the Knowle and Dorridge area is already greater than the local infrastructure and local character can sustain . However, if any Amber or Red Sites were to be considered for inclusion, I would support the inclusion of Red Site 207 ahead of Amber Site 413 - more in keeping with existing housing density and better served by road and public transport infrastructure.
Q39	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Strongly believe that our Client's site (reference 404) should be included as a 'green' site.
Q39	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	LAND AT WIDNEY MANOR ROAD: SITE REFERENCE 407 should be included as a 'green' site. Object it has been assessed as 'red'. We do not agree with the conclusion that it will have 'severe or widespread impacts that are not outweighed by the benefits of the proposal'. The site is in one of the most sustainable locations in the Borough. There are no constraints which can't be mitigated. Has strong defensible green belt boundaries. Would achieve 100% affordable housing.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	<p>We consider our Client's site (reference 416) should be included as a 'green' site. Site is well enclosed by defensible boundaries to the west by Ashford Lane and a detached dwelling; to the south by School Road and a detached dwelling; and to the north by another detached dwelling and agricultural buildings. Do not agree that landscape presents a constraint to development, the character assessment is broad in nature and a more site-specific assessment would arrive at a different conclusion having regard to the context of this site. A number of larger allocations have similar landscape characteristics. Site adjacent to 84 School Lane is assessed as green and our site could result in an identical conclusion. Site contains good accessibility to services and facilities in the village. This includes Hockley Heath Primary School and a bus service to Dorridge, which contains a rail station with direct links to Solihull and Birmingham. Other nearby services in Hockley Heath can be accessed by a short walk or cycle. Hockley Heath should be higher in the settlement hierarchy and identified as suitable for higher levels of growth. We consider that Hockley Heath is a sustainable location for additional housing growth as it has a sufficient range of services and facilities within the village, including a primary school.</p> <p>There are no constraints which cannot be mitigated, including heritage, flooding, ecology, trees and access. Development here would not adversely impact upon the character of the settlement.</p> <p>Improved accessibility is proposed for properties along School Road to and from the village centre through the provision of a footpath.</p> <p>The site is in single ownership and is available for development with no legal or ownership problems.</p> <p>It is free from significant constraints and there is strong market demand for housing in this area, it can therefore be considered deliverable (from the point of Local Plan adoption) in terms of the definition within the NPPF.</p>
Q39	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land South of Park Lane [6133]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Land South of Park Lane should be included as a 'green' site when considered for employment use.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	Consider our Client's site (SHELAA Ref. 417) should be included as a 'green' site: - Site should score similarly to land adj. to 84 School Road - Green Belt gap not too narrow - Landscape buffer can be added to site - Site has capacity to provide land for community infrastructure such as primary school, sports pitches, GP surgery - Hockley Heath should be placed higher in the spatial strategy hierarchy of settlements, as a sustainable location with services and regular bus service to Dorridge & Solihull. - Site is suitable, achievable and available now.
Q39	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site 142 and 233 - Grange Farm, Balsall Common Site is within moderately performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment, and would result in an defensible boundary to north and west particularly if a link road were proposed to take traffic across to the A452 from Balsall Street . Site has a medium level of accessibility, is in an area of high visual sensitivity with very low capacity for change and is deliverable. The SA identifies 6 positive and 7 negative effects Settlement identified as suitable for significant expansion, and site could have a defensible green belt boundary. Better to develop on the west side of Balsall Common than the east side with adequate space to develop new centre
Q39	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site 238 - Redwoods Wootton Green Lane Disagree with Site Assessment - Site is within moderately performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment, is small and would round off development on south side of Wootton Green Lane. Site has a medium level of accessibility, is in an area of high visual sensitivity with capacity for change having regard to Trevallion Stud etc on the north side.. The SA identifies 5 positive and 6 negative effects. Settlement is identified for significant growth, and site would have defensible green belt boundary

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site 244 - Land at Tilehouse Green - Copt Heath Golf Course The site is located immediately adjacent to the built up area of Knowle and straddles the Green Belt boundary around the settlement. The southern half of the site is located within the settlement outside the Green Belt and the northern half is situated in the Green Belt, in a lower performing parcel. Whilst there are no permanent physical features that would easily define a new boundary, the site is well-contained and there appear to be strong field boundaries. The site has few constraints and represents a logical 'rounding off' to this part of the settlement. The golf course to the north and west would prevent further expansion into the countryside. The site has a medium level of accessibility and is in an area with medium landscape character sensitivity. This site should be elevated to amber if not green
Q39	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site 422 - Land at Rose Bank, Balsall Street Site is within moderately performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment, although it is small but would result in boundaries to the south and west which are as defensible as many other sites identified for release. Site has a medium level of accessibility, is in an area of high visual sensitivity with very low capacity for change and is deliverable. Balsall Common is identified as suitable for significant expansion, the site is noted as being suitable for consideration as a windfall site, and should be elevated to green or amber
Q39	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site 82 - Land north of Dengate Drive, Balsall Common Site is within moderately performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment, but would not result in indefensible boundaries. Site has a medium level of accessibility, is in an area of high visual sensitivity with very low capacity for change and is deliverable, subject to some constraints. The SA identifies 5 positive and 5 negative effects, although only the distance to jobs is a significant negative. Settlement identified as suitable for significant expansion, and site would have defensible green belt boundary to the south at Dengate Drive, a woodland to the west and track to the north. This site should be elevated to amber if not green, and considered for release in conjunction with Grange Farm or at a later date
Q39	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site 83 - Land at Catherine de Barnes Site assessment is incorrect. Land is clearly shown outside of Green Belt on previous proposal maps, but site assessment puts it into the Green Belt without justification. Site is bounded by Canal and common land to the north, both defensible boundaries. Site should be elevated to green or amber

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site 86 - Land at Old Station Road Hampton in Arden Site is recognised as brownfield land on the Register and within a lower performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment, but site is not isolated with existing development to the south and west which would result in an a defensible boundary. The site has a medium level of accessibility, is within a area of medium landscape sensitivity with low capacity for change, and is suitable for development. The site should be elevated to amber if not green
Q39	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site 91 - Home Farm Berkswell Site is within highly performing parcel in the Green Belt Assessment, would result in defensible boundaries, and is a natural extension to the existing business park providing local employment ion the local rural community. Site has good level of accessibility, and Balsall Common is identified as suitable for significant expansion. In the absence of the Council providing no new employment sites this site expands on an existing provision. Site should be elevated to green or amber
Q39	Richard Cobb Planning (Mr Richard Cobb) [2464]		Site 92 - New Mercote Farm Kenilworth Road Having regards to the previous comments on the need for more employment land in Balsall Common, this site was promoted for that purpose. Site is well contained by the road and rail corridor, and is no more or less isolated from the settlement than other sites being released to the south of the village centre. Site has a good level of accessibility, is in an area of high visual sensitivity with capacity for change. Balsall Common is identified as suitable for significant expansion, and this site would provide a high profile business site for employment in the expanding settlement. Site should be elevated to green or amber
Q39	Richard Lloyd [2616]		There are a large number of smaller sites around the fringe of the built-up area of Knowle, Dorridge, and Bentley Heath, which would seem to have good accessibility and relatively low impact on the Green Belt. However, the largest missed opportunity is the rejection of the concept of new settlements. The new settlement opportunity identified in the G L Hearn study falls into the area of Sites 76 and 212 at Mercote. The area is well sited for access to UK Central and the major road network. Good quality high frequency bus services already operate in the area. Area does not have high green belt value and proposal supported by Parish Council.
Q39	Richard Onions [4280]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Richborough Estates [3816]	Star Planning and Development (Sir or Madam) [2747]	Land at Tanworth Lane, Cheswick Green site reference 99 should be deleted from green belt when new boundary for settlement is defined and allocated for housing or safeguarded for longer-term development needs. Site has no insurmountable constraints, would not be visually intrusive and would have defensible green belt boundary. Site could provide 130-140 dwellings based on landscape-led approach. An up to date site assessment is provided to replace the site assessment prepared by the Council.
Q39	Roderick Hatton [5809]		Alternative sites north of Balsall Common should be considered.
Q39	Roger Howles [6238]		Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q39	Rosconn Strategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Part of site 340 lies within previous site 13. These should still be included as allocations. The suggested advantages of site 26 over site 13 are not accepted. Site 13 has not been dismissed for technical reasons. Similar site issues e.g. coalescence, maintaining a Green Belt gap apply equally to other sites but are not referenced. These can be mitigated on Site 13. Masterplanning of sites 11, 12, 13 together in terms of infrastructure, form and content made complete sense. Site 26 is within a highly performing Green Belt parcel; site 13 is not. Site 121 - Little difference between this site and site allocation 25.
Q39	Rosconn Strategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The landscape features on site 121 are substantial and will create a firm and defensible Green Belt boundary. The site does not extend as far out into the countryside as the existing development to the north and south of the site and it cannot be described as an incursion into open countryside. Site 121 is more centrally located and has a stronger relationship to the village. It also offers the opportunity for providing a doctors surgery. Site 121 should replace site 25 or be allocated in addition.
Q39	Rosconn Strategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	The land east of Solihull has been supplemented by adding land above Lugtrout Lane and identifying the Grand Union Canal as the proposed new Green Belt boundary. The masterplans appear to suggest different boundaries and in some instances exclude sites 143 and 339. The site assessment document indicates the sites as green or amber. The SDLP supplementary document suggests the sites are part of the housing allocation site 16. This appears to be an anomaly and a printing error and as such would request confirmation that this land Site Refs 143 & 339 are included within the proposed allocation.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Schools of King Edward VI in Birmingham [3520]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Mr Miles Drew) [3519]	<p>SHELAA Site 11, Widney Manor Road.</p> <p>Do not agree with categorisation as a red site. Contend this is a consequence of: i) a flawed Q02; and ii) flawed judgements that have been applied in the assessment of Site 111.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disagree that site is isolated, as reflected in PBA SHELAA - Site has medium accessibility as referred to in evidence - SA and Accessibility Study differ in assessment of proximity to primary school - Disagree with Green Belt Assessment, should be lower performing parcel - SHELAA Assessment is incorrect, is not in a Flood Zone - Site promoter working with Cadent Gas on gas pipeline - Disagree with Landscape Assessment's relevance to site - Disagree with elements of Sustainability Appraisal (see letter) - Site has achievable capacity of 79 dwellings.
Q39	Simon Taylor [4550]		<p>- Red sites 42, 49, 81, 97, 107, 128, 195, 197, 211 and 226 should be considered for inclusion to allow for reduction in proposed allocations in other areas which are significantly overweight, inequitable and in direct contradiction to the core principles</p>
Q39	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	<p>Site 304 Oakes Farm Balsall Common performs better than Barratt's Farm in methodology Step 1 and is bounded by hedgerow providing defensible boundaries. Should be allocated for development.</p> <p>Site east of Warwick Road/north of Wyndley Garden Centre, Knowle would be similar priority to Site 9 to east, could retain hedgerows and ditches and will be significantly more accessible with the allocation of Site 9.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	St Philips Ltd [6228]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Kate Green) [6227]	<p>Do not agree that SHELAA Site 131 should be red but green after the Step 2 refinement criteria.</p> <p>We assume that the Step 2 Assessment will have scored the site highly in terms of 'Factors in Favour' given the lack of hard constraints (and limited soft constraints) and that it comprises part of a 'Lower Performing Refined Parcel' (with a combined score of 3 against the 'threshold' score for lower performing parcels of a combined score of 5).</p> <p>The site complies with the Spatial Strategy in the 2016 DLP: Not subject to any overriding hard constraints Category 2 not 3 SHELAA site - Vision document shows how concerns can be mitigated.</p> <p>Site would not breach strong defensible Green Belt boundaries, as not GB parcel boundaries not considered strong in the Green Belt assessment. Site is in accessible location. Landscape Character does not have very low capacity. Sustainability Appraisal is generally favourable, and negative impacts can be overcome.</p>
Q39	St Philips Ltd [6228]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Kate Green) [6227]	<p>Site ref 131: Birmingham Business Park, adj. Coleshill Heath Road.</p> <p>St Philips is promoting the allocation of the land for the delivery of up to 135 dwellings within the first five years of the new Local Plan period.</p>
Q39	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	<p>St Philips consider that Site 503, 1.7ha of land east of Stratford Road, Hockley Heath should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for development to meet the future housing needs of the settlement, in conjunction with land off Aylesbury Road in Warwick District, which will be promoted through the review of the Warwick District Local Plan.</p>
Q39	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	<p>Whilst site 25 has not been tested against the Accessibility Study and Green Belt Assessment, its suitability can be compared with the scoring of site 38 Ashford Manor Farm, Stratford Road given its proximity. Site 38 is considered medium/high in accessibility and lower performing parcel in terms of Green Belt with a combined score of 5. However, the Site Assessment Commentary notes that 'it would be difficult to establish a logical and defensible Green Belt boundary.'</p> <p>Disagree as Site 38 self contained and bound by permanent physical features, and should be identified for housing allocation.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	<p>Site 207 is adjacent to the settlement boundary, there are limited suitability constraints, the site is bound by roads which are a physical feature that could provide a new Green Belt boundary. Redevelopment of the site would not compromise the five purposes of the green Belt.</p> <p>The site represents a location which supports the Council's strategic direction of growth.</p> <p>Seek reassessment of site 207 to correctly be categorised as a Priority 5 site. Site 207 should be included as an allocation.</p>
Q39	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	<p>We believe our client's site should be included (CFS207).</p> <p>St Phillips' site is adjacent to the settlement boundary, there are limited suitability constraints (as demonstrated in the Solihull SHLAA 2016), the site is bound by roads which are a physical feature that could act as a new Green Belt boundary and the redevelopment of the site would not compromise the five purposes of the green Belt</p> <p>As stated in our response to Question 2, we also seek the reassessment of our client's site to correctly be</p>
Q39	Stephen Dunn [6275]	Sworders (Miss Michelle Hill) [6070]	<p>Site 110 should be a green site.</p> <p>Since the assessment, the site has been reduced in area and there is possible links with site 98.</p> <p>The site would now score very highly in accessibility for all facilities and would be adjacent to the village centre. There would be a reduction in encroachment into the countryside and less impact on Green Belt. Comments relating to the majority of the site being detached from the main settlement and there being limited development present are now irrelevant. A defensible Green Belt boundary could be created through a track and field boundaries.</p>
Q39	Steven Lyle [2914]		<p>Why are developments currently focused on Knowle rather than being spread more evenly across the wider KDBH area? There are many proposed sites to the SW of Dorridge (29, 127, 199, 210 & 247) and NW of Bentley Heath (3, 72, 88, 108, 207 & 419). Were some of these to be developed they would potentially a) result in at least some of the additional traffic moving westwards and northwards out of the KDBH area, thereby taking some of the pressure off Knowle and b) give new residents a shorter and easier route to city rail links via Dorridge Station.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Strategic Land and Property Team SMBC [6226]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	Red Site ref 52: Chester Road/Moorend Avenue. Site should be released from the Green Belt to help the Borough meet its development needs. Site is in a sustainable location and low scoring parcel of Green Belt. Development of the site would positively meet the objectives of the Draft Local Plan Review
Q39	Summix (FHS) Developments Ltd [4455]	Framptons Planning (Mr Greg Mitchell) [2685]	Significant errors in site assessment for Site 313. Step 1 should be priority 6 as accessibility high and moderately performing in Green Belt Assessment. Step 2 important judgements on green belt/landscape not based on robust evidence. Assigning Broad Areas score of 3 for Purpose 3 in GBA is flawed/unsound and artificially inflates score. Evidence provided demonstrates site has limited impact on Purpose 3 and would not undermine remaining green belt. Methodology to establish visual sensitivity in LCA muddled/poorly justified with no explanation how classification criteria assessed/judged. High classification based on ancient woodland not evident within site, whilst sub-urban influences in/around settlement ignored. Detailed robust evidence is provided to show site well-contained, capable of accommodating development with limited visual impacts.
Q39	Tanworth Educational Foundation [6205]	Hancock Town Planning (Mr Joel Hancock) [1937]	Objects to the omission of Red Site 57: land adjoining 2102 Stratford Road, Hockley Heath. Has same accessibility assessment as allocated site 25. The site is also assessed as being within a lower performing green belt and landscape character area as site 25. The only difference between the two sites appears to be that the Borough Council has concluded 'it would be difficult to establish a new logical and defensible green belt boundary in this location'. Green belt boundaries are very defensible and site 57 is a separate visually self contained parcel of vacant land clearly differentiated from open farmland. Disagree site has high landscape sensitivity and very low capacity to accommodate change. This is based on fact site falls within large landscape character assessment area 2, inadequate for assessing 0.12 ha site fronting busy A3400. Land opposite four storey Hockley Court business space and relates to built up area of Hockley Heath. Contributes little towards purposes of the green belt. Is visually separated from wider landscape, opposite to substantial multistorey buildings, is a very small site which would not erode the gap between settlements, is not within open countryside already bounded and fenced off, Hockley Heath is not a historic town and development of this site could enhance approach to village, would have no impact on urban regeneration elsewhere

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Terra Strategic [5698]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	<p>We submit that Site 81, Land North of Fillongley Road, Meriden, should not be omitted and should be included in the Submission Draft Local Plan.</p> <p>This site immediately adjoins Meriden to the east and offers a highly sustainable option to bring forward additional housing growth as outlined in the Proposal Site Supporting Statement submitted with this response.</p> <p>The site could be brought forward either on its own or as part of a larger sustainable northern expansion of the village between the existing settlement and the A45.</p> <p>Please see full representation.</p>
Q39	Terry Corns [4446]		<p>Alternative sites in the "gap" between Knowle & Solihull would be preferable to both the major proposed sites to the north and south of Knowle centre.</p> <p>Access to transport links, the M42 and employment areas would be far superior and would be less damaging to existing residents</p> <p>For example the "Red" site ref 207 (land bounded by Browns Lane, Smiths Lane & Widney Manor Road) would be more suitable than the land south of Knowle avoiding unnecessary intrusion into the Green belt.</p>
Q39	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		<p>Eight alternative sites (as suggested in 2017 DLP response). Site ref: 34, 103, 199, 13, 14, 57, 121 The consultation has sought to demonstrate the suitability of site allocations in its <u>selection process</u>.</p>
Q39	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>Land at 15,59,61 Jacobean Lane should be included as an allocation.</p> <p>The site appears to fail on Green Belt and accessibility issues. Access onto Jacobean Lane can be created thereby improving accessibility. Commentary suggesting difficulties in establishing a new defensible boundary is contested. Boundary fencing with substantial tree and hedgerow planting provides firm and defensible Green Belt boundaries. The site performs equally well or better in Green Belt terms than some allocations.</p> <p>It is clearly part of and relates well to the village in terms of its character layout and context.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	Wendy Cairns [4226]		Some red sites to the west of Balsall Common are worthy of consideration in conjunction with a west bypass that would remove virtually all of the through north south traffic and provide a defensible boundary for such a development. Site 1015 (which an amalgamation of 142, 198 and 223) should be re-evaluated
Q39	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	<p>Evidence in stage 2 of the site assessment also confirms the site is suitable for development particularly when compared with sites proposed for allocation. Suitability was also demonstrated in the 2016 SHELAA where it was assessed as a category 1 which could commence within 5 years but by comparison the southern parcel of the DLP proposed site 10 was assessed as category 2 and DLP site 6 is identified as category 3 as not currently developable. Site also performs extremely well within the accessibility study. Again findings are inconsistent when compared to other sites. Site also performs to a similar standard or better than comparable sites that have been proposed for allocation within the greenbelt assessment. Despite all of this the site is designated as a red site. Site lies within landscape character parcel which only has medium sensitivity and is more favourable when compared to proposed allocations within Meriden and Hockley Heath. The Sustainability appraisal is also favourable to the site having fewer negative and more positive impacts than other sites proposed for allocation.</p> <p>The issues of 'indefensible boundaries' and 'visual intrusion' are given a considerable amount of weight in the site assessment process despite the site being assessed favourably in other areas. This is unfounded as this can be readily mitigated and is not permanent. In fact, the advice given by SMBC within the DLPSC (para 75) states that "sites that would use or create a strong defensible boundary to define the extent of land to be removed from the Green Belt" would be considered favourably. It is clear that SMBC have shown inconsistency in the application of site assessment methodology notably this is reflected in the lack of a robust definition for clearly defined boundaries. The DLPSC gives conflicting views on the definition and approach to this, in some instances placing significant emphasis on defensible boundaries as permanent and physical boundaries.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q39	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	<p>Hampton in Arden' (Assessment Site Ref. 6). Q02 has been inconsistently applied and as a result DLPSC has unfairly discounted this site. Evidence within the site assessment document confirms the site to be highly achieving against a number of the matrices, the site performs better than proposed allocations of a similar size and location within settlements of the same Settlement Hierarchy class. Attached appendix A comparison table compares the application of the methodology and associated evidence base in relation to the site (Land off Old Station Road) and comparable sites. It shows a lack of consistency in the justification and associated decision-making set against that same evidence base, resulting in Land off Old Station Road being identified as unsuitable and excluded from further consideration. The sites used for comparison are of similar size and character; having a similar capacity, being wholly or predominantly greenfield, lying within the Green Belt, and lying within a settlement that is within a settlement of the same hierarchy as Hampton in Arden. The table demonstrates that the findings contained with the site assessment document and associated evidence base reinforce that Land off Old Station Road continually performs highly when assessed against the key criteria; including in relation to the spatial vision, site constraints, deliverability, accessibility, impact on Green Belt performance, and sensitivity of landscape character. Significantly, the site adheres to the DLP's spatial vision, reaching a 'Yellow' score of 5 overall in Step 1 of the Site Selection process. Notably, the site scores more favourably than Land South of School Road, Hockley Heath, which is proposed for allocation as DLP Site 25.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Affordable Housing Policy and Open Market Housing Mix			
Q40	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		<p>This potential policy proposal to use a percentage of square meter floorspace, percentage of bedrooms or percentage of habitable rooms could lead to undesirable unintended consequences.</p> <p>Such a scheme should not be used without evidence from such an approach already in use achieving an improvement in provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>SMBC should have regard to the emerging Balsall Parish NDP Policy H. 7</p>
Q40	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		<p>Residents' interest is primarily smaller homes to buy so that the children of Balsall Common residents can buy a property in Balsall Common. The affordable housing definition does not help this group and that is disappointing.</p> <p>Support higher proportion of shared ownership/Starter/discounted homes.</p> <p>Plan should make specific reference to providing land on large developments for alms houses by Berkswell Charities.</p>
Q40	Bloor Homes [6243]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	<p>We consider that this approach of affordable housing contributions is unconventional and could generate a greater than 50% of housing units being provided for affordable housing, where the mix for private included more 2 and 4 bedroom houses than is required for affordable. We consider that this in-turn could negatively affect the overall site mix, development viability and prohibit development.</p> <p>We object to this affordable housing approach until further evidence can be provided to justify a habitable room/floor space requirement. We consider that the Council's existing approach on affordable housing is more appropriate.</p>
Q40	Catesby Estates Limited [3038]	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	<p>Proposed policy threshold above which affordable housing is required should accord with Government policy which states that affordable housing should only be sought on sites of more than 10 dwellings (or where the gross floorspace exceeds 1.000 sqm).</p> <p>Calculation by floorspace not fully justified or consistent with national policy and confuses requirement with housing mix/type of housing. Alternative approach will not provide clear indication of requirement, and is not justified through viability assessment.</p>
Q40	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>This is a question that developers will need to answer.</p> <p>The intentions are good and I am glad that SMBC are asking this question. As to whether it will cause "someone else" to take a different course of action, it is the "someone else" alone who can answer. It will need to be reviewed as to whether it does produce the desired effect in addressing affordability. There needs to be an evidence base to be reassured of the results it will produce.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		As part of the starter homes initiative the government have made changes to the section 106 agreement to include starter homes as part of the affordable homes requirement for new developments. We need to ensure that the social and affordable homes built are to a standard comparable with more expensive homes and rents capped at affordable levels. Clearly, habitable size needs to be adequate and comfortable for the inhabitants and those nearby. We need new developments to contribute to ending fuel poverty, so any affordable homes need to have enough space for living/storage and be energy efficient.
Q40	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Do not support proposal to switch from a percentage based affordable housing calculation to a floorspace percentage calculation. The justification for this is given as a need to drive up the proportion of smaller properties being delivered. However, the Council has not published any analysis of its assumptions which underpin the comments made in this section; and appears to be confusing matters relating to housing mix; housing size and matters relating to affordable housing provision. These are separate matters. No evidence that such an amendment will have effect of providing smaller market housing.
Q40	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Q40 to Q43 see detail in letter
Q40	Dickens Heath Residents Association (Trevor Eames) [6245]		The Residents Association supports the retention of the existing unit number policy for measuring affordable housing provision.
Q40	Duchy Homes Ltd [6036]	Barton Willmore Planning (Miss Hiteshree Kundalia) [6035]	This approach would cause uncertainty for developers and the Council and is not likely to work in practice. It would not be clear how much affordable housing which will be delivered through the draft Plan. If the Council allocate sufficient sites which have proportionate evidence regarding their viability and deliverability, this would be the best way of addressing the delivery of much-needed affordable housing.
Q40	Edward Fraser [4138]		Habitable square meterage of the site should affordable housing

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No evidence has been provided to justify the alternative approach now being taken. It appears that the Council is using affordable housing policy to deal with identified issues associated with market housing mix such as delivering smaller housing, increasing densities and minimising Green Belt release. The current approach of requiring affordable contributions on total sq meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace would not comply with affordable housing site thresholds set out by Government in the Written Ministerial Statement dated 28th November 2014 or para 64 of the NPPF 2019.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Gladman Developments (Mr Craig Barnes) [6041]		<p>Considers that the need and justification for the proposed approach does not reflect the evidence base supporting the Local Plan. Questions justification for 50% affordable housing requirement when evidence provided within the Part 2 SHMA would appear to indicate that affordable housing needs are much lower at 210 dwellings per annum (roughly 25% of future housing need). No data provided as part of the consultation to illustrate the mix of housing delivered within the Borough in recent years. The Part 2 SHMA sets out that the largest proportion of future housing need is for 4 bedroom dwellings or more. There is not a significant need for smaller housing stock. Concern over how the Council would monitor the implementation of the proposed approach for affordable housing. The total number of dwelling secured would be on a case by case basis therefore the Council would be unable to conclude how effective the Local Plan would be in responding to affordable housing need. This is more problematic for outline planning applications where details relating to the number of bedrooms, habitable rooms, and floorspace are more likely to be determined later through the detailed application stage. As a result, for outline planning applications the principle of development will be secured without information on the amount of affordable housing to be provided. The Council is unlikely to know what impact the implementation of this policy would have on viability, harming the soundness of the Local Plan. This absence of viability evidence, together with the variation of conditions in which the policy would be applied would mean that applications would need to be viability tested on a site by site basis. This would substantially increase the length of time it would take for the Council to determine planning applications. A percentage-based policy based on the number of homes delivered, as currently adopted, gives more certainty and clarity as to the Council's requirements and provides a measurable target for the Council to consider the performance of housing delivery against. The perceived shortage in the delivery of smaller housing types could be more effectively addressed through the application of other policy tools. Starter homes now form part of the definition of affordable housing but do not remain as affordable homes in perpetuity and as such will one day form part of the Borough's supply of market dwellings. Given the restrictions placed on starter homes in terms of price paid, size and type this will increase the supply of smaller stock within the Borough. Density requirements may also be effective in securing a higher proportion of smaller dwellings.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	<p>No. Such an approach is highly complex and open to abuse.</p> <p>We disagree that the existing approach of a percentage calculated on unit numbers leads to an incentive on developers to increase the size of units and reduce numbers. Developers ultimately seek to build houses and will bring forward schemes that reflect market demand and what they can sell in terms of size and mix of new homes. Oversizing of units is not in a developer's interest.</p> <p>Please see full representation.</p>
Q40	Hampton Road Developments Ltd [4643]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	<p>We consider this approach to be unconventional and could lead to a greater than 50% of housing units being provided for affordable housing, where the mix for private includes more 2 and 4 bed houses than is required for affordable. This could negatively affect the overall site mix. We object to this approach until further evidence can be provided to justify a habitable room/floor space requirement. We consider that where the Council seeks to pursue an unconventional approach and a departure from a % of overall dwellings, then a clear justification should be provided.</p>
Q40	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (John Pearce) [6261]	<p>No, as would encourage fewer larger units, so overall affordable housing numbers would decrease. Changes in layout/mix may not match Section 106 Agreements creating difficulties and additional work.</p>
Q40	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	<p>We would not support a percentage-based approach to affordable housing and consider that the Council is attempting to address issues relating to housing mix, and the provision of smaller dwellings, with the need for affordable housing provision. These matters are separate and should not be joined together through planning policy.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Fiona Lee-McQueen) [6265]	<p>It is considered that the proposed approach to affordable housing and market mix is confused and should be reviewed as part of the preparation of the next stage of the Local Plan.</p> <p>It is standard practice for affordable housing contributions to be calculated as a percentage of the overall number of dwellings and there is no evidence to suggest that the alternative approach of calculating provision based on floorspace would encourage the delivery of a higher proportion of smaller market dwellings. Experience within the industry is that the use of a square meterage approach does not enhance the delivery of either market of affordable housing. There are a much larger range of factors to take into account when developing an appropriate mix of housing; particularly on large development sites where the creation of a high quality 'place' is critical. This approach reflects the policies set out with the 2019 NPPF.</p>
Q40	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	<p>IM considers the Council's proposed approach to dealing with affordable housing and market mix to be confused. It is standard practice for affordable housing contributions to be calculated as a percentage of the overall number of dwellings and there is no evidence to suggest that this alternative approach would encourage the delivery of a higher proportion of smaller market dwellings. The Local Plan should deal with the matters of affordable housing requirements and market mix separately. This will ensure a clear position for both the Council and developers reducing the likelihood of overly complex negotiations during the determination of applications.</p> <p>Any changes in the approach to calculating affordable housing would need to be supported by evidence (including updated viability evidence) justifying the need for and suitability of this change.</p>
Q40	Jennifer Archer [4016]		<p>The requirement for social/affordable housing is set by the Council depending on demand. Therefore my opinion on this point is really irrelevant</p>
Q40	Joelle Hill [4425]		<p>Whilst I feel this is the right approach, it would appear that it is relatively easy for developers to gradually whittle down the affordable element of developments once the process has begun. Evidence of this can be seen across the country where affordable % have been reduced on the basis of not being 'commercially viable' to the developer and then the whole development being held to ransom on this point. What evidence can Solihull Planning department give to support that they would be able to robustly enforce this approach in the face of opposition from the developers on commercial grounds?</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	- The Council's proposed approach is not clear. The Council is attempting to deal with identified issues associated with market housing mix including more smaller market dwellings, increasing housing densities on all sites and minimising release of Green
Q40	Michael Moran [5681]		Any measure to ensure housing is more affordable for younger people is welcome in order to reduce the obscene disparity in property ownership between age groups in Solihull
Q40	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No evidence has been provided to justify the alternative approach now being taken. It appears that the Council is using affordable housing policy to deal with identified issues associated with market housing mix such as delivering smaller housing, increasing densities and minimising Green Belt release. The current approach of requiring affordable contributions on total sq meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace would not comply with affordable housing site thresholds set out by Government in the Written Ministerial Statement dated 28th November 2014 or para 64 of the NPPF 2019.
Q40	Mr Eric Homer [3721]		I am in favour of supporting the Council delivering the affordable housing it needs. I would be in favour of changing affordable housing contributions on qualifying sites to 40% of habitable development area if this helps to meet affordable housing needs. I am in favour of moving from a percentage calculated on unit numbers if this will incentivise developers to build more, smaller homes, increase the numbers of open market houses, increase housing density, reducing the amount of green belt land that needs to be used for development. This will also support the Council delivering the affordable housing it needs.
Q40	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		40% affordable housing is too high and must be reduced to 20%,comment applies to 40to43 questions.
Q40	Mr John Gibbs [5865]		Against any proposal that incentivises making housing smaller and smaller, and cramming more and more houses on a plot. It's not even a good model for chickens, let alone humans. However, taking more green belt land for housing reduces the area of countryside, which is vital for everyone's quality of life. The best way is to reduce the population, and therefore demand for houses.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Mr M Trentham [2114]		There are already viability problems on some developments related to the affordable housing requirement. The Council is deliberately seeking to increase such problems by being too greedy. It is unreasonable to expect that affordable (i.e. subsidised) housing should be of the same size or standard as market housing. The current method of measuring the requirement as a straight percentage of unit numbers is simple and effective. Such rules might produce the opposite result from that intended, i.e. rather than building more small market homes, developers will build fewer but larger affordable dwellings, in order to preserve the profitability.
Q40	Mr N Walters [2802]		Yes it should, there needs to be a rebalance as new developments provide too many 4,5 & 6 bed housing to compensate for the 40% affordable contribution.
Q40	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		I would agree the existing target incentivises inappropriate development
Q40	Mr Steve Coathup [6078]		I find it incredible that you are asking lay people what will incentivise developers, when you deal with them every day. Clearly developers have a financial duty to shareholders to maximise their profitability. Your role as planners is to represent the interests of the local community as rate payers who a) fund the local authority and b) have more interest in the local environment than developers. These objectives are diametrically opposed. I believe therefore that the needs of the community should take preference to the profit incentive of developers.
Q40	Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]		Affordable housing is almost non existent in solihull. I think the decision where and how many affordable homes should not be made by any one party only, especially <u>not the builders.</u>
Q40	Mrs Linda Homer [3729]		I am in favour of supporting the Council delivering the affordable housing it needs. I would be in favour of changing affordable housing contributions on qualifying sites to 40% of habitable development area if this helps to meet affordable housing needs. I am in favour of moving from a percentage calculated on unit numbers if this will incentivise developers to build more, smaller homes, increase the numbers of open market houses, increase housing density, reducing the amount of green belt land that needs to be used for development. This will also support the Council delivering the affordable housing it needs.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Mrs Marilyn Jones [5718]		As a lay person I can't really comment on which approach should be used re affordable housing. However I do feel that affordable housing should not just be directed to first time buyers/renters etc but consideration should be given to families needs. Therefore I would want to see 3/4/5/6 bedroom affordable housing to be made available for families.
Q40	Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]		We do not need large areas of affordable housing. I believe this will just create another Chelmsley Wood. Affordable housing needs to be spread over all new sites with plenty of green open spaces.
Q40	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		Beyond my knowledge base. As observation, one sees huge 5/6 bedroom developments as for example in Tanworth in Arden and Knowle when in reality, that land could have been used for smaller affordable housing.
Q40	Mrs Sally Woodhall [3580]		Affordable housing needs to be spread through all new housing developments not concentrated in any one area
Q40	Ms B Bird [2065]		Developers will always look for the means of making most money. Young people who have grown up locally should have a chance to buy a property here.
Q40	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		<p>The Council's proposed approach is confused.</p> <p>The Council is attempting to deal with identified issues associated with market housing mix including more smaller market dwellings, increasing housing densities on all sites and minimising release of Green Belt land via an alternative approach to affordable housing contributions. These matters are separate and should not be co-joined.</p> <p>No justifying evidence for proposed alternative approach.</p> <p>It is noted that the wording of Question 40 states a requirement for affordable housing contributions on the total square meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace.</p> <p>Proposal would not comply with Written Ministerial Statement 28.11.14 of Para.64</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Peter Brett Associates LLP (Tim Coleby) [6198]		Agrees that the delivery of smaller homes as part of a balanced mix of housing is important. However, requiring affordable housing as requirement based on a proportion of net residential floorspace would not incentivise the delivery of smaller market homes. It could act to discourage the delivery of some types of homes. A block of small apartments can have a higher net residential floor area than the equivalent land-take for family homes therefore would require a greater amount of affordable housing but with less revenue with implications for economic viability which would conflict with paragraph 67 of NPPF. Placing too much emphasis on the delivery of smaller homes or requiring affordable housing as a proportion of net residential floorspace would not achieve the policy objective to meet in full the identified housing requirements in terms of numbers, sizes, tenures and types. It is not an effective, justified or sound policy basis to ensure that the identified housing requirement will be met in full over the plan period. Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states there should be an evidence based approach to determine the minimum number of homes that are needed. An affordable policy requirement based on a proportion of net residential could also make it difficult for the LPA to assess the effectiveness of the plan. The wording of any affordable housing policy should also take into account the updated and wider definition of affordable housing set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF.
Q40	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		No. The appropriate mechanism for securing smaller market housing is achieved using density policy. It is a requirement of plan making that account is taken of national policy. The approach to increasing densities is set out at paragraphs 122 and 123 of the National Planning Policy Framework. As is evident from those paragraphs it is necessary to approach the articulation of density policies having regard to several factors including the character of the surrounding area.
Q40	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Fulford Hall Road [6117]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	No. This approach would cause uncertainty for developers and the Council and is not likely to work in practice. It would not be clear how much affordable housing will be delivered through the draft Plan. If the Council allocate sufficient sites which have proportionate evidence regarding their viability and deliverability, this would be the best way of addressing the delivery of much-needed affordable housing.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land at Widney Manor Road [6120]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	No. This approach would cause uncertainty for developers and the Council and is not likely to work in practice. It would not be clear how much affordable housing will be delivered through the draft Plan. If the Council allocate sufficient sites which have proportionate evidence regarding their viability and deliverability, this would be the best way of addressing the delivery of much-needed affordable housing. Our Client's site LAND AT WIDNEY MANOR ROAD: SITE REFERENCE 407 can deliver affordable dwellings on a suitable site in a sensitive and well-designed manner.
Q40	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land Fronting Waste Lane [6131]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	No. This approach would cause uncertainty for developers and the Council and is not likely to work in practice. It would not be clear how much affordable housing will be delivered through the draft Plan. If the Council allocate sufficient sites which have proportionate evidence regarding their viability and deliverability, this would be the best way of addressing the delivery of much-needed affordable housing.
Q40	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land North of School Road [6122]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	No. This approach would cause uncertainty for developers and the Council and is not likely to work in practice. It would not be clear how much affordable housing will be delivered through the draft Plan. If the Council allocate sufficient sites which have proportionate evidence regarding their viability and deliverability, this would be the best way of addressing the delivery of much-needed affordable housing.
Q40	Rainier Developments Ltd - Land West of Stratford Road [6125]	Barton Willmore Planning (Mark Singer) [5908]	No. This approach would cause uncertainty for developers and the Council and is not likely to work in practice. It would not be clear how much affordable housing will be delivered through the draft Plan. If the Council allocate sufficient sites which have proportionate evidence regarding their viability and deliverability, this would be the best way of addressing the delivery of much-needed affordable housing.
Q40	Rentplus [3150]	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	Approaches based on the square meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace are not generally supported due to the inherent difficulties in designing for the policy, which causes developers to calculate the appropriate level of delivery by reference to optimal market floorspace instead of baseline numbers. This also causes difficulties in decision making and monitoring of delivery, and therefore in setting appropriate responses to underdelivery of affordable housing. Requiring the balance of market and affordable housing to be calculated by reference to such detailed calculations as floorspace will inevitably result in a reduction in the quality of placemaking.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Richard Lloyd [2616]		The Planning Authority should take an objective view of housing needs and ensure they are delivered. There is little doubt that density has been too low, given the shortage of land and the need created for motorised transport. Consequently, the Planning Authority should control the housing density to appropriate levels through all the sites. Many surveys indicate a view there is a shortage of mid-size dwellings suitable for young couples. These should be provided in adequate numbers on all sites.
Q40	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No evidence has been provided to justify the alternative approach now being taken. It appears that the Council is using affordable housing policy to deal with identified issues associated with market housing mix such as delivering smaller housing, increasing densities and minimising Green Belt release. The current approach of requiring affordable contributions on total sq meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace would not comply with affordable housing site thresholds set out by Government in the Written Ministerial Statement dated 28th November 2014 or para 64 of the NPPF 2019.
Q40	Simon Taylor [4550]		- Not convinced approach incentivises smaller market housing. - Developers could simply increase scale of larger homes to increase overall meterage, so that smaller homes were medium sized. - SMBC's Meeting Housing Needs SPD states the need vs supply of
Q40	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		No Members supported the retention of the existing unit system as well established and easily understood, it was also felt the present 40% affordable policy was at the very top end of the scale with concern expressed at the level of cross subsidy from market housing falling especially heavily on younger and first time buyers rather than general taxation
Q40	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	Spitfire are not supportive of the Council's revised approach to affordable housing contributions which is are not supported by any evidence and will cause complexities/ delays in the delivery of all future housing sites within the Borough. Concur with comments made by HBF.
Q40	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	We do not consider that the proposed approach is suitable and the Council has not provided any justification/evidence as to why they are proposing this alternative approach to affordable housing. We consider that the Council's existing approach to affordable housing is more appropriate

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No evidence has been provided to justify the alternative approach now being taken. It appears that the Council is using affordable housing policy to deal with identified issues associated with market housing mix such as delivering smaller housing, increasing densities and minimising Green Belt release. The current approach of requiring affordable contributions on total sq meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace would not comply with affordable housing site thresholds set out by Government in the Written Ministerial Statement dated 28th November 2014 or para 64 of the NPPF 2019.
Q40	Taylor Wimpey [579]	Lichfields (Zoe Simmonds) [5575]	While Taylor Wimpey are supportive of SMBC's ambition to increase the delivery of affordable housing, it is not considered that changing the way affordable housing is calculated in any of the ways suggested is a practical and workable solution. Taylor Wimpey are of the view that affordable housing should be calculated by a proportion (40%) of the number of units being proposed. The type and size of housing provided for both private sale and affordable housing should instead reflect market demand and local need.
Q40	Terra Strategic [5698]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	No. Such an approach is highly complex and open to abuse. We disagree that the existing approach of a percentage calculated on unit numbers leads to an incentive on developers to increase the size of units and reduce numbers. Developers ultimately seek to build houses and will bring forward schemes that reflect market demand and what they can sell in terms of size and mix of new homes. Oversizing of units is not in a developer's interest. Please see full representation.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	Tetlow King Planning (Julie O'Rourke) [5586]		<p>Potential difficulties in designing development schemes and determining whether the policy has led to delivery as identified in the needs assessment.</p> <p>Schemes would be designed around numbers, not good placemaking or meeting identified needs (and demand). Approach limits the policy's flexibility and the flexibility with which a site can be designed to meet housing needs and still be viable.</p> <p>Should such a policy be implemented without accompanying guidance on housing mix, relying instead on market forces to deliver this, schemes could be badly skewed towards an arbitrary numerical target instead of housing needs. This could lead to overly dense, or very low density developments which do not reflect actual housing need, with developers seeking to provide larger affordable homes to meet the 40% requirement which may not be affordable.</p> <p>Need to consider impact on delivering regeneration schemes. If an estate regeneration scheme is measured to avoid net loss of habitable rooms or floorspace instead of unit numbers, this could compromise the ability to effectively meet housing needs. If an estate is currently over-occupied there may need to be a smaller number of larger units provided in the regeneration scheme, whilst another characterised by under-occupation may need a higher number of smaller units. These nuances must be reviewed by the Council in understanding the potential impacts of any change in policy approach to seeking affordable housing from mixed tenure schemes.</p>
Q40	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		<p>The Council is attempting to deal with identified issues associated with market housing mix including more smaller market dwellings, increasing housing densities on all sites and minimising release of Green Belt land via an alternative approach to affordable housing contributions. These matters are separate and should not be co-joined.</p>
Q40	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		<p>This suggestion is close to the ideal but not quite there.</p> <p>At present, the gross internal floor areas of market housing are subject to a continual downwards direction to make them smaller whilst still maximising the price the accommodation of each house offers to the market.</p> <p>The result is housing which should provide less accommodation eg three bedrooms, rather than 4, in an acceptable total floor space area so that its usable space is in fact, truly useable by it being capable of housing the requisite number of people comfortably, irrelevant of its tenure.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q40	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	No evidence has been provided to justify the alternative approach now being taken. It appears that the Council is using affordable housing policy to deal with identified issues associated with market housing mix such as delivering smaller housing, increasing densities and minimising Green Belt release. The current approach of requiring affordable contributions on total sq meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace would not comply with affordable housing site thresholds set out by Government in the Written Ministerial Statement dated 28th November 2014 or para 64 of the NPPF 2019.
Q40	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	WDL does not consider there to be any evidence to demonstrate that such an approach would incentivize developers in this way. Indeed, seeking affordable housing contributions based on the total square meterage or habitable rooms / floorspace would not comply with the affordable housing site thresholds set out by the Government in the Written Ministerial Statement dated 28th November 2014 and NPPF 2019 (para 64).

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Affordable Housing Policy and Open Market Housing Mix			
Q41	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		<p>This potential policy proposal to use a percentage of square meter floorspace, percentage of bedrooms or percentage of habitable rooms could lead to undesirable unintended consequences.</p> <p>Such a scheme should not be used without evidence from such an approach already in use achieving an improvement in provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>SMBC should have regard to the emerging Balsall Parish NDP Policy H. 7</p>
Q41	Berkswell Parish Council (Mr Richard Wilson) [2092]		<p>Residents' interest is primarily smaller homes to buy so that the children of Balsall Common residents can buy a property in Balsall Common. The affordable housing definition does not help this group and that is disappointing</p> <p>Support higher proportion of shared ownership/Starter/discounted homes.</p> <p>Plan should make specific reference to providing land on large developments for almshouses by Berkswell Charities.</p>
Q41	Bloor Homes [6243]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	<p>Unless there is compelling evidence to support otherwise, we object to a change in the approach to calculating affordable housing. Most LPAs approach affordable housing on a % of the total housing units and we consider that this approach should remain in place to enable housebuilders to compare like for like opportunities across LPA boundary areas.</p>
Q41	Catesby Estates Limited [3038]	WYG (Miss Sarah Butterfield) [3245]	<p>Proposed policy threshold above which affordable housing is required should accord with Government policy which states that affordable housing should only be sought on sites of more than 10 dwellings (or where the gross floorspace exceeds 1.000 sqm).</p> <p>Calculation by floorspace not fully justified or consistent with national policy and confuses requirement with housing mix/type of housing. Alternative approach will not provide clear indication of requirement, and is not justified through viability assessment.</p>
Q41	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		(C) Habitable square meterage.
Q41	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		<p>Affordable housing should not lack what market homes have in terms of space and storage. Housing strategies should set out targets for the provision of housing, which shall be sufficient to meet the needs of the current and future population, taking account of current levels of homelessness, overcrowding, concealed households, affordability, inadequate or unsuitable housing, and households unable to meet their housing needs without some form of assistance, and taking account of the need to protect land for habitats, industrial and commercial uses, and recreation. So, it should be higher than 40%.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q41	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		Habitable meterage.
Q41	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	<p> floorspace calculation will not provide certainty to developers and landowners at point of site acquisition.</p> <p>This is one of the reasons that Stratford District moved away from this policy to a standard percentage of units-based policy, which was supported during their last Local Plan review.</p> <p>Change in approach will slow down planning application process, and bring viability matters into play more frequently.</p> <p>Note that this approach would run counter to the WMS on affordable housing which does not seek contributions on sites of 10 dwellings or fewer (i.e. based on dwelling numbers and not floorspace calculations)</p>
Q41	Dickens Heath Parish Council (Ms H Marczak) [2253]		<p>Oppose change to the unit basis of calculation and consider the existing unit basis at 40% for the affordable element is already exceptionally high.</p> <p>Support the retention of the unit housing measurement as a clearly understood basis given the system is already required to meet housing size, mix and accommodation standards set down by the local authority.</p>
Q41	Dickens Heath Residents Association (Trevor Eames) [6245]		The Residents Association supports the retention of the existing unit number policy for measuring affordable housing provision.
Q41	Edward Fraser [4138]		Habitable square meterage
Q41	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	<p>This is not considered an effective approach. Standard Practise is to calculate on number of units. This provides more certainty at the outset of development. A change from this could see an adverse impact on the delivery of affordable housing.</p> <p>New viability evidence should be carried out to support this new approach.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q41	Gladman Developments (Mr Craig Barnes) [6041]		<p>Considers that the need and justification for the proposed approach does not reflect the evidence base supporting the Local Plan. Questions justification for 50% affordable housing requirement when evidence provided within the Part 2 SHMA would appear to indicate that affordable housing needs are much lower at 210 dwellings per annum (roughly 25% of future housing need). No data provided as part of the consultation to illustrate the mix of housing delivered within the Borough in recent years. The Part 2 SHMA sets out that the largest proportion of future housing need is for 4 bedroom dwellings or more. There is not a significant need for smaller housing stock. Concern over how the Council would monitor the implementation of the proposed approach for affordable housing. The total number of dwelling secured would be on a case by case basis therefore the Council would be unable to conclude how effective the Local Plan would be in responding to affordable housing need. This is more problematic for outline planning applications where details relating to the number of bedrooms, habitable rooms, and floorspace are more likely to be determined later through the detailed application stage. As a result, for outline planning applications the principle of development will be secured without information on the amount of affordable housing to be provided. The Council is unlikely to know what impact the implementation of this policy would have on viability, harming the soundness of the Local Plan. This absence of viability evidence, together with the variation of conditions in which the policy would be applied would mean that applications would need to be viability tested on a site by site basis. This would substantially increase the length of time it would take for the Council to determine planning applications. A percentage-based policy based on the number of homes delivered, as currently adopted, gives more certainty and clarity as to the Council's requirements and provides a measurable target for the Council to consider the performance of housing delivery against. The perceived shortage in the delivery of smaller housing types could be more effectively addressed through the application of other policy tools. Starter homes now form part of the definition of affordable housing but do not remain as affordable homes in perpetuity and as such will one day form part of the Borough's supply of market dwellings. Given the restrictions placed on starter homes in terms of price paid, size and type this will increase the supply of smaller stock within the Borough. Density requirements may also be effective in securing a higher proportion of smaller dwellings.</p>
Q41	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Do not agree with the approach.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q41	Hampton Road Developments Ltd [4643]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	We consider this approach to be unconventional and could lead to a greater than 50% of housing units being provided for affordable housing, where the mix for private includes more 2 and 4 bed houses than is required for affordable. This could negatively affect the overall site mix. We object to this approach until further evidence can be provided to justify a habitable room/floor space requirement. We consider that where the Council seeks to pursue an unconventional approach and a departure from a % of overall dwellings, then a clear justification should be provided.
Q41	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (John Pearce) [6261]	No, 40% of total units
Q41	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	We do not support this approach and suggest that a system based on unit numbers, in line with national guidance, is appropriate. If the Council continues with this approach it should demonstrate that the proposed method will not render schemes unviable given the amount of affordable housing may be higher than 40% of the total unit numbers.
Q41	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	- The calculation of affordable housing contributions on bedroom numbers, habitable rooms or habitable square meterage are not considered an effective approach. - It is standard practice that affordable housing contributions are calculated on the basis of
Q41	Michael Moran [5681]		I believe any measure is to be encouraged but developers may produce better quality affordable homes if the approach is based on habitable square meterage
Q41	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	This is not considered an effective approach. Standard Practise is to calculate on number of units. This provides more certainty at the outset of development. A change from this could see an adverse impact on the delivery of affordable housing. New viability evidence should be carried out to support this new approach.
Q41	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		40% affordable housing is too high and must be reduced to 20%,comment applies to 40to43 questions.
Q41	Mr M Trentham [2114]		NO I understand that there are already viability problems on some developments related to the affordable housing requirement. KEEP IT SIMPLE.
Q41	Mr N Walters [2802]		40% of gross floor area of each dwelling.
Q41	Ms B Bird [2065]		Option c

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q41	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		The calculation of affordable housing contributions on bedroom numbers, habitable rooms or habitable square meterage are not considered an effective nor appropriate approach. It is standard practice that affordable housing contributions are calculated on the basis of numbers of units. The Council's proposed alternative approach will not provide the necessary certainty for developers or decision makers with regard to its implementation. Alternative approach will cause difficulties in viability negotiations. Council not provided viability evidence to justify alternative approach.
Q41	Rentplus [3150]	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	Approaches based on the square meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace are not generally supported due to the inherent difficulties in designing for the policy, which causes developers to calculate the appropriate level of delivery by reference to optimal market floorspace instead of baseline numbers. This also causes difficulties in decision making and monitoring of delivery, and therefore in setting appropriate responses to underdelivery of affordable housing. Requiring the balance of market and affordable housing to be calculated by reference to such detailed calculations as floorspace will inevitably result in a reduction in the quality of placemaking.
Q41	Richard Lloyd [2616]		A clear policy detailing the mix of houses to be provided in each part of the Borough would allow applications for excessive numbers of large dwellings to be refused
Q41	Rosconn Stategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	This is not considered an effective approach. Standard Practise is to calculate on number of units. This provides more certainty at the outset of development. A change from this could see an adverse impact on the delivery of affordable housing. New viability evidence should be carried out to support this new approach.
Q41	Sheila Cooper [2560]		Support the building of primarily smaller homes to buy so that the children of residents can buy a property in Balsall Common. Support SMBC's wish to build more smaller homes. Support shared ownership projects, starter homes and discounted homes (as per annex 2 of the 2019 NPPF). These types of property would meet more diverse needs. Steps should be taken to provide charitably run homes for vulnerable people. Not qualified to comment in detail on Q41, but developers need to be tied firmly into binding contract to provide smaller affordable homes, not permitted to avoid obligation because of financial reasons.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q41	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Do not support the change of unit measure policy Members supported the retention of the existing unit system as well established and easily understood, it was also felt the present 40% affordable policy was at the very top end of the scale with concern expressed at the level of cross subsidy from market housing falling especially heavily on younger and first time buyers rather than general taxation
Q41	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	Spitfire are aware of representations prepared by the HBF and concur with the comments made in respect of Question 41.
Q41	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	We do not consider that the proposed approach is suitable and the Council has not provided any justification / evidence as to why they are proposing this alternative approach to affordable housing. We consider that the Council's existing approach to affordable housing is more appropriate
Q41	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	This is not considered an effective approach. Standard Practise is to calculate on number of units. This provides more certainty at the outset of development. A change from this could see an adverse impact on the delivery of affordable housing. New viability evidence should be carried out to support this new approach.
Q41	Terra Strategic [5698]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Do not agree with the approach.
Q41	Tetlow King Planning (Julie O'Rourke) [5586]		Approach will not overcome the Council's concerns with low provision of smaller market homes. Should the habitable rooms in the open market element of a scheme be quite large but few in number, this will not necessarily equate to an increase in delivery of affordable homes. This may have the unintended consequence of larger affordable homes being provided which do not meet Q01s, are not affordable and may be difficult to re-let or sell on shared ownership terms. Setting a threshold based on the habitable floorspace may be too onerous, adversely impacting on scheme densities to the detriment of good design in cases where viability is marginal and the number of units must increase to achieve a policy-compliant level of affordable floorspace.
Q41	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		The calculation of affordable housing contributions on bedroom numbers, habitable rooms or habitable square meterage are not considered an effective approach.
Q41	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		None of these alternatives. To provide a 40% true representation of the total number of dwellings proposed for a site, then there should be provided 40% of each house type as affordable, thus by definition achieving a 40% representation of the whole.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q41	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	This is not considered an effective approach. Standard Practise is to calculate on number of units. This provides more certainty at the outset of development. A change from this could see an adverse impact on the delivery of affordable housing. New viability evidence should be carried out to support this new approach.
Q41	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	WDL does not consider the calculation of affordable housing contributions based on bedroom numbers, habitable rooms, or habitable square meterage to be an effective approach to delivering affordable homes. Indeed, such an approach is considered likely to create uncertainty as to the number of affordable units required, resulting in prolonged negotiations and a slowing of the planning application process. Moreover, it is standard practice for affordable housing contributions to be calculated on the basis of the numbers of units proposed in conjunction with development and, as such, WDL continues to fully support this approach.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Affordable Housing Policy and Open Market Housing Mix			
Q42	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		<p>This potential policy proposal to use a percentage of square meter floorspace, percentage of bedrooms or percentage of habitable rooms could lead to undesirable unintended consequences.</p> <p>Such a scheme should not be used without evidence from such an approach already in use achieving an improvement in provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>SMBC should have regard to the emerging Balsall Parish NDP Policy H. 7</p>
Q42	Bloor Homes [6243]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	<p>We consider that this approach of affordable housing contributions is unconventional and could generate a greater than 50% of housing units being provided for affordable housing, where the mix for private included more 2 and 4 bedroom houses than is required for affordable. We consider that this in-turn could negatively affect the overall site mix, development viability and prohibit development.</p> <p>We object to this affordable housing approach until further evidence can be provided to justify a habitable room/floor space requirement. We consider that the Council's existing approach on affordable housing is more appropriate.</p>
Q42	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Habitable floorspace
Q42	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		40% (if it stays at 40%) should be habitable floorspace, designed so that the tenants may design their own space to suit
Q42	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Not supported - should keep to a units based policy.
Q42	Dickens Heath Residents Association (Trevor Eames) [6245]		The Residents Association supports the retention of the existing unit number policy for measuring affordable housing provision.
Q42	Edward Fraser [4138]		Floorspace
Q42	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Considered to be an inappropriate approach as discussed in 40 & 41.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q42	Gladman Developments (Mr Craig Barnes) [6041]		<p>Considers that the need and justification for the proposed approach does not reflect the evidence base supporting the Local Plan. Questions justification for 50% affordable housing requirement when evidence provided within the Part 2 SHMA would appear to indicate that affordable housing needs are much lower at 210 dwellings per annum (roughly 25% of future housing need). No data provided as part of the consultation to illustrate the mix of housing delivered within the Borough in recent years. The Part 2 SHMA sets out that the largest proportion of future housing need is for 4 bedroom dwellings or more. There is not a significant need for smaller housing stock. Concern over how the Council would monitor the implementation of the proposed approach for affordable housing. The total number of dwelling secured would be on a case by case basis therefore the Council would be unable to conclude how effective the Local Plan would be in responding to affordable housing need. This is more problematic for outline planning applications where details relating to the number of bedrooms, habitable rooms, and floorspace are more likely to be determined later through the detailed application stage. As a result, for outline planning applications the principle of development will be secured without information on the amount of affordable housing to be provided. The Council is unlikely to know what impact the implementation of this policy would have on viability, harming the soundness of the Local Plan. This absence of viability evidence, together with the variation of conditions in which the policy would be applied would mean that applications would need to be viability tested on a site by site basis. This would substantially increase the length of time it would take for the Council to determine planning applications. A percentage-based policy based on the number of homes delivered, as currently adopted, gives more certainty and clarity as to the Council's requirements and provides a measurable target for the Council to consider the performance of housing delivery against. The perceived shortage in the delivery of smaller housing types could be more effectively addressed through the application of other policy tools. Starter homes now form part of the definition of affordable housing but do not remain as affordable homes in perpetuity and as such will one day form part of the Borough's supply of market dwellings. Given the restrictions placed on starter homes in terms of price paid, size and type this will increase the supply of smaller stock within the Borough. Density requirements may also be effective in securing a higher proportion of smaller dwellings.</p>
Q42	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Do not agree with the approach.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q42	Hampton Road Developments Ltd [4643]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	We consider this approach to be unconventional and could lead to a greater than 50% of housing units being provided for affordable housing, where the mix for private includes more 2 and 4 bed houses than is required for affordable. This could negatively affect the overall site mix. We object to this approach until further evidence can be provided to justify a habitable room/floor space requirement. We consider that where the Council seeks to pursue an unconventional approach and a departure from a % of overall dwellings, then a clear justification should be provided.
Q42	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (John Pearce) [6261]	No, 40% of total units
Q42	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	We do not support this approach and suggest that a system based on unit numbers, in line with national guidance, is appropriate. If the Council continues with this approach it should demonstrate that the proposed method will not render schemes unviable given the amount of affordable housing may be higher than 40% of the total unit numbers.
Q42	Joelle Hill [4425]		Habitable floor space
Q42	Kier Group [301]	Cerda Planning Ltd (Clare Garrad) [6138]	It is an inappropriate approach irrespective of the way used to measure developable space.
Q42	Michael Moran [5681]		Habitable floor space
Q42	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Considered to be an inappropriate approach.
Q42	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		40% affordable housing is too high and must be reduced to 20%,comment applies to 40to43 questions.
Q42	Mr M Trentham [2114]		NO I understand that there are already viability problems on some developments related to the affordable housing requirement. KEEP IT SIMPLE.
Q42	Mr N Walters [2802]		40% of gross floor area, bigger houses tend to have 2 or 3 reception rooms double or triple garages etc so you need to capture all floor area.
Q42	Mrs Jean Walters [2569]		Habitable floorspace
Q42	Ms B Bird [2065]		Habitable floor space.
Q42	Pauline Daniels [3674]		Number of bedrooms
Q42	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		It is an inappropriate approach irrespective of the way used to measure developable space (see answers to Questions 40 & 41 above).

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q42	Rentplus [3150]	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	Approaches based on the square meterage or habitable rooms/floorspace are not generally supported due to the inherent difficulties in designing for the policy, which causes developers to calculate the appropriate level of delivery by reference to optimal market floorspace instead of baseline numbers. This also causes difficulties in decision making and monitoring of delivery, and therefore in setting appropriate responses to underdelivery of affordable housing. Requiring the balance of market and affordable housing to be calculated by reference to such detailed calculations as floorspace will inevitably result in a reduction in the quality of placemaking.
Q42	Rosconn Statagic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Considered to be an inappropriate approach.
Q42	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Do not support the change of unit measure policy Members supported the retention of the existing unit system as well established and easily understood, it was also felt the present 40% affordable policy was at the very top end of the scale with concern expressed at the level of cross subsidy from market housing falling especially heavily on younger and first time buyers rather than general taxation
Q42	Spitfire Bespoke Homes [4409]	Ridge and Partners LLP (Emma Greening) [6225]	Spitfire are not supportive of the Council's revised approach to affordable housing provision and concur with the views made by the HBF.
Q42	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Savills (Jessica Graham) [2567]	We do not consider that the proposed approach is suitable and the Council has not provided any justification / evidence as to why they are proposing this alternative approach to affordable housing. We consider that the Council's existing approach to affordable housing is more appropriate
Q42	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Considered to be an inappropriate approach.
Q42	Terra Strategic [5698]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	Do not agree with the approach.
Q42	Tetlow King Planning (Julie O'Rourke) [5586]		Further analysis is required to understand what the impact of any of the proposed measures would have been, had these been introduced and imposed on schemes already subject to planning applications, and in the future for those sites already known to be coming forward. Similar work has been conducted in London in response to the London Plan policies; This should be reviewed and similar analysis undertaken by the Council to understand the potential impact in Solihull. Viability testing should be completed to ensure that any proposed approach would act to maximise affordable housing delivery, and not disincentivise delivery.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q42	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		It is an inappropriate approach irrespective of the way used to measure developable space.
Q42	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		None of these alternatives. The gross floorspace of any house allows for non-habitable space included such as utility rooms, kitchens and bathrooms, all of which are an important factor taken into account by prospective purchasers/shared equity owners/tenants. Their omission could seriously adversely affect overall floor space of a house by building smaller houses but maintaining the stated habitable accommodation space being provided. Whether market or affordable housing, their overall floor areas should be the same for each house type being provided.
Q42	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Considered to be an inappropriate approach.
Q42	Tidbury Green Parish Council (Miss Charlotte Kirby) [2531]		Habitable floorspace would be more appropriate.
Q42	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	WDL considers this to be an inappropriate approach irrespective of the way used to measure developable space.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Affordable Housing Policy and Open Market Housing Mix			
Q43	Balsall Parish Council (Judith Parry-Evans) [2500]		<p>This potential policy proposal to use a percentage of square meter floorspace, percentage of bedrooms or percentage of habitable rooms could lead to undesirable unintended consequences.</p> <p>Such a scheme should not be used without evidence from such an approach already in use achieving an improvement in provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>SMBC should have regard to the emerging Balsall Parish NDP Policy H. 7</p>
Q43	Bloor Homes [6243]	Savills (Mr Michael Davies) [2285]	<p>The approach most developers take to housing sites is one of market demand. Where there is a strong demand for smaller market houses then house builders will build them. To rigidly require house builders to build more smaller houses may reduce the ability to meet the market requirements for larger 3 and 4 bed houses. If the supply of these houses is artificially restricted then there is a risk that asking prices would increase which could in turn affect the asking price of smaller properties. Whilst some guidance is expected, a policy influence on the market housing mix is unnecessary.</p>
Q43	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		<p>Facilitating partnership working with a variety of providers.</p> <p>The housing crisis cannot be addressed by developers alone. There are different providers that will be able to address specific components of it. Solihull Community Housing will need to play a key role in ensuring Social Housing is delivered as part of the housing mix. Housing Associations and Co-operatives should also be invited to cooperate. Each will have specialisms that can address different gaps in the market.</p>
Q43	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		<p>In Solihull, initiatives encouraging tenants to take greater control of their homes and communities by becoming involved in co-operatives, tenant management organisations and estate management boards, so long as these don't provide a first step towards privatisation of housing.</p> <p>So, I am pushing alternative means , other than private development . This should be sought as priority. Plus, private, commercial organisations house builders and their representatives should not be involved in the process of identifying potential, I sites or assessing housing needs on behalf of the local communities in Solihull.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q43	Councillor T Hodgson [2532]		Recognise that Solihull, along with the rest of the country, faces a housing crisis. Very troubled by the position of our young people, who face great difficulty finding affordable homes. Solihull Council has in recent years encouraged and allowed the construction of housing for the over 55s to the point of having a surplus for this age group while younger people continue to struggle to be housed. Like to see much stronger policy on addressing affordable homes for our younger residents.
Q43	David Wilson Homes [160]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ms Kathryn Ventham) [2162]	Individual sites should cater for a wide range of housing types and sizes. Provision of only small dwellings on sites will not develop long term sustainable communities. Instead it will result in a transient community where people will not be able to form long term neighbourhoods as they will need to move on as their circumstances change, if there are insufficient homes of the right size on a site to accommodate them. Do not consider this represents good planning, focus should be on building strong healthy communities which can cater for all rather than simply planning for short term ownership.
Q43	Dickens Heath Residents Association (Trevor Eames) [6245]		The Residents Association supports the retention of the existing unit number policy for measuring affordable housing provision.
Q43	Edward Fraser [4138]		Accept tenders only from Developers who are committed to build 40% or more affordable housing, if necessary have joint housing projects with the Council or Housing associations.
Q43	Generator (Balsall) & Minton [6280]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should be about providing an appropriate mix of housing for all and responding to need across the board i.e. families, elderly, self-build as well as smaller units

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q43	Gladman Developments (Mr Craig Barnes) [6041]		<p>Considers that the need and justification for the proposed approach does not reflect the evidence base supporting the Local Plan. Questions justification for 50% affordable housing requirement when evidence provided within the Part 2 SHMA would appear to indicate that affordable housing needs are much lower at 210 dwellings per annum (roughly 25% of future housing need). No data provided as part of the consultation to illustrate the mix of housing delivered within the Borough in recent years. The Part 2 SHMA sets out that the largest proportion of future housing need is for 4 bedroom dwellings or more. There is not a significant need for smaller housing stock. Concern over how the Council would monitor the implementation of the proposed approach for affordable housing. The total number of dwelling secured would be on a case by case basis therefore the Council would be unable to conclude how effective the Local Plan would be in responding to affordable housing need. This is more problematic for outline planning applications where details relating to the number of bedrooms, habitable rooms, and floorspace are more likely to be determined later through the detailed application stage. As a result, for outline planning applications the principle of development will be secured without information on the amount of affordable housing to be provided. The Council is unlikely to know what impact the implementation of this policy would have on viability, harming the soundness of the Local Plan. This absence of viability evidence, together with the variation of conditions in which the policy would be applied would mean that applications would need to be viability tested on a site by site basis. This would substantially increase the length of time it would take for the Council to determine planning applications. A percentage-based policy based on the number of homes delivered, as currently adopted, gives more certainty and clarity as to the Council's requirements and provides a measurable target for the Council to consider the performance of housing delivery against. The perceived shortage in the delivery of smaller housing types could be more effectively addressed through the application of other policy tools. Starter homes now form part of the definition of affordable housing but do not remain as affordable homes in perpetuity and as such will one day form part of the Borough's supply of market dwellings. Given the restrictions placed on starter homes in terms of price paid, size and type this will increase the supply of smaller stock within the Borough. Density requirements may also be effective in securing a higher proportion of smaller dwellings.</p>
Q43	Golden End Farms [5628]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	A strong policy on housing type and mix which is enforced at planning application stage.
Q43	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (John Pearce) [6261]	Importance of evidence in up to date SHMA/HNA to show need for more smaller market housing. Could incentivise developers by requiring less developer contributions elsewhere in development.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q43	IM Land [3900]	Barton Willmore Planning (Ed Pigott) [6221]	the Council is seeking to utilise affordable housing provision to address a different issue. Sufficient land for housing should be allocated to meet the needs of the Borough, and the wider region. This should include scope for different types of housing to come forward to meet specific needs. The Council should also ensure that balanced and mixed developments come forward to avoid scheme which fail to create communities and enhance social cohesion. The overprovision of smaller housing in specific areas may lead to transient populations and development which does not meet the definition of sustainable development.
Q43	Jennifer Archer [4016]		By not using the current RICS standard method.
Q43	Joelle Hill [4425]		This is not about incentivising but obliging the developers to provide the required larger numbers of affordable housing. This is not really just a local issue but a national one and the government should tighten control of the planning process to enforce affordable house building. Solihull COuncil will not be able to address this problem in isolation.
Q43	Michael Moran [5681]		Tighter palnning regulations within the borough allied with help to access cheaper sources of funding to source to support builders of small homes
Q43	Minton [4420]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should be about providing an appropriate mix of housing for all and responding to need across the board i.e. families, elderly, self-build as well as smaller units.
Q43	Mr Esak Shabudin [5686]		40% affordable housing is too high and must be reduced to 20%,comment applies to 40to43 questions.
Q43	Mr M Trentham [2114]		The Council would also do well to consider that such rules might produce exactly the opposite result from that intended. building more small market homes, developers will build fewer but larger affordable dwellings, in order to preserve the profitability of the development. In such a case you may well end up with fewer than 40% by number. Another effect of being over-generous with affordables is that the occupiers will have no incentive to move out and acquire market housing of their own, even when they become financially able to buy, so more and more affordables will be required.
Q43	Mr N Walters [2802]		Price cap on land! The single biggest driver for house price inflation is land pricing and land banking, landowners are given too much power in land prices and developers landbank over decades to realize inflated values on strategic land. Affordable housing land needs capping to realize more realistic house prices.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q43	Mr Richard Drake [3541]		I think a simple housing unit measure would be more appropriate. However, I question if 40% is the right number for Balsall Common's needs. It would result in people moving here as somewhere to live away from their existing work and social links with an inadequate public transport supply.
Q43	Mr Steven Webb [2960]		I personally don't agree with the view that people should be packed in like rabbits which seems to be the approach the council is putting forward. Just look at Dickens Health, it's a terrible, terrible place for people to live. The council should be paying more attention to quality of housing, quality of materials and development and overall improvement of peoples lifestyles not just simply treating people as sardines because it meets some vague management/political target. The council in short should be pushing back and trying to improve the communities lives rather than wreck them.
Q43	Mrs Alex Woodhall [3635]		I think the residents need to have a large say in what is built where
Q43	Mrs Caroline Drake [3561]		A simple % of housing units built would seem simpler and more effective. However, the location of affordable housing needs to be matched to where it is needed by locality not at a Borough level. 40% of the proposed new houses in Balsall Common would be over 400 houses and it is hard to see a local demand for them
Q43	Mrs Jane Starling [3207]		Developers want their developments to be desirable and do not want to squeeze in as many small properties as possible to reach council affordable housing targets. Maybe the council should not be using up green belt in the most expensive parts of the borough for houses which by definition should not be affordable as starter homes. It is not as though most people buying affordable (or very expensive) houses in the Knowle area are going to live here but will travel to areas where there is work. This is where the housing needs to be.
Q43	Mrs Olga Cawdell [3637]		Developers have too much say in what and where houses are build, I think the council and local residents should have the final say.
Q43	Persimmon Homes Central (Mr Richard Hodson) [5157]		All households should have access to different types or dwellings to meet their housing needs. Market signals are important in determining the size and type of homes needed. When planning for an acceptable mix of dwellings types to meet people's housing needs the Council should focus on ensuring that there are appropriate sites allocated to meet the needs of specifically identified groups of households such as families, older people and / or self-build rather than setting a specific housing mix on individual sites

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q43	Rentplus [3150]	Tetlow King Planning (Meghan Rossiter) [3203]	We recommend that the Council look to diversify the market and affordable housing 'offer' by setting policies that detail general house type, size and mix expectations with sufficient flexibility to respond to needs over the Plan's lifetime. This should include the full range of affordable housing tenures to maximise the number of affordable homes that can be delivered across Solihull over the Plan period, and to ensure a diversity of needs are met, including for those who cannot afford to buy without a period of affordable rent.
Q43	Rosconn Strategic Land [4416]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should be about providing an appropriate mix of housing for all and responding to need across the board i.e. families, elderly, self-build as well as smaller units.
Q43	Simon Taylor [4550]		If a cap is placed on the total housing per site (suggest 50% of proposed allocation), with the cap only increased (ceiling of 100% proposed allocation) if smaller market housing is included, this would incentivise developers to build more of the latter (on the basis the scope of their overall development would be limited without)
Q43	Solihull Ratepayers Association (Mr T Eames) [2539]		Do not support the change of unit measure policy Members supported the retention of the existing unit system as well established and easily understood, it was also felt the present 40% affordable policy was at the very top end of the scale with concern expressed at the level of cross subsidy from market housing falling especially heavily on younger and first time buyers rather than general taxation
Q43	Stonewater [3271]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should be about providing an appropriate mix of housing for all and responding to need across the board i.e. families, elderly, self-build as well as smaller units.
Q43	Terra Strategic [5698]	Delta Planning (Mr David Green) [2225]	A strong policy on housing type and mix which is enforced at planning application stage.
Q43	Tetlow King Planning (Julie O'Rourke) [5586]		The Council should seek to understand the impacts of any change in the affordable housing threshold measure by calculating how this would have impacted on development proposals that have already been assessed at application stage, and those likely to come forward through this Plan Review. Once this work has been completed the most appropriate mechanism to use will become clearer. Consider a combination of policies on expected housing type, size and tenure mix together with an appropriate threshold measure. The use of the optional National Space Standards across all tenures may be a useful measure where this is justified by local need, and is viable. This may assist in coordinating floorspace across tenures. Introducing this for single tenures is generally resisted as this can have the impact of reducing scheme viability.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q43	The Home Builders Federation Midland Region (Sue Green) [4626]		All households should have access to different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs.
Q43	The Knowle Society (Mr Andrew Marston) [2916]		Rather than incentivise such an approach, minimum standards should be set of accommodation intended for families of a certain number of people. Market research by developers highlight detailed awareness of demand in any location for new housing. The suggestion is that the Council should impose pre-stated minimum areas for each home relative to its intended occupancy as a matter of high importance.
Q43	the landowners at Jacobean Lane [6279]	DS Planning (Ms Donna Savage) [2382]	Should be about providing an appropriate mix of housing for all and responding to need across the board i.e. families, elderly, self-build as well as smaller units.
Q43	William Davis Ltd [671]	Define Planning & Design (Kirstie Clifton) [6144]	WDL propose that all households should have access to different types of dwellings to meet their housing needs and that market signals are an important factor in determining the size and type of homes needed. Furthermore, the Council should focus on ensuring that there are appropriate sites (providing a wide range of types across a wide range of locations) allocated to meet the needs of specifically identified groups of households, such as families, older people and / or self-build, rather than setting a specific housing mix on individual sites.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Any Other Comments			
Q44	Albanwise Ltd [6247]	Barton Willmore (Mr Daniel G Wilson) [5480]	<p>Site promoters for: 'Land at Wychwood Roundabout', (SHLAA Site Reference:125)</p> <p>The Site is available for development, deliverable, sustainable and well located in the context of Knowle.</p> <p>The Site is within close walking distance to a range of amenities, services, facilities and transport links. Albanwise Limited propose to deliver a masterplanned scheme which integrates well into the existing character of the area.</p> <p>We consider there is potential to develop the Site for housing in order to contribute in the early phase/s of the Local Plan period.</p> <p>General: Welcome Local Plan Review in response to High Court challenge on adopted Local Plan.</p>
Q44	Alison Robbins [4062]		<p>Despite changes to the initial plan, Shirley South is still to receive 38% of proposed new housing in the Solihull borough, which remains disproportionate and unacceptable given the size of the borough.</p> <p>New housing should be developed to compliment current and new infrastructure.</p> <p>In the case of HS2, which is referred to in the current plans, this will be running to the North of the borough and not stopping anywhere near to these proposed Shirley developments. This will create more congestion from people driving to the HS2 station, as there is inadequate public transport to that area of the borough.</p>
Q44	Andrea Baker [3471]		<p>When Solihull has a lot of brownfield, derelict sites bartering for new customers and standing empty, building on our limited green belt and removing rural features from the semi-rural villages should not be a viable option.</p>
Q44	Andy Wilson [3394]		<p>Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.</p>
Q44	Angela Cameron [6264]		<p>SHELAA site 163 - The former Rectory & Glebe Land should be excluded from Plan.</p> <p>Site is fully developed, within a conservation area, and redevelopment will cause disruption and expense to existing occupiers. Lack of suitable alternative premises for existing uses.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Anna Waters [6204]		Balsall Common of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers. This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2. Brown field sites are being developed in addition to greenfield sites rather than instead of. Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement
Q44	Annie Lutzy [6293]		During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.
Q44	Arden Academy & Mr V Goswami (Executive Principal) [4176]	Urban Vision Partnership Ltd (Mrs Janette Findley) [3046]	The inclusion of BLR 024 in the list suggests one of two scenarios: Either 1) that the site is not considered to form part of the Site 9 allocation; Or 2) that there is no intention to allow a more appropriate capacity to be assigned as part of the allocation, contrary to the statement in paragraph 438. Inclusion of site in the concept masterplan would increase capacity on Site 9.
Q44	Arden Cross Consortium (Ben Gray) [6262]		Plan must support opportunity for major development provided by HS2 Interchange station in sound and evidential manner. Arden Cross preparing revised vision and master plan to provide further evidence of site's potential. Recognise need for significant level of up-front investment in infrastructure enhancements. Removal of land from green belt essential to achieve objectives. Whilst reasons for delay in Plan preparation recognised, hope that any future delays can be kept to absolute minimum so that development opportunity can be realised.
Q44	Arta Golestani [5527]		Balsall Common - Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Barry Jackson [3957]		Why are there so many homes near Shirley. The infrastructure cannot cope with it. Roads Schools and so on.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Belle Homes Ltd [3936]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>St. George and Teresa School, site 155, capacity 31 dwellings, is in educational use and no evidence to show suitable alternative site. Should not be included in SHELAA sites calculation for housing supply.</p> <p>Safeguarded land should be identified and removed from green belt to meet future need and avoid need to alter green belt boundaries in review.</p> <p>Evidence behind Review flawed, no detailed landscape/ecological assessments of preferred/amber sites, additional/smaller parcels require assessment for GBA, no revision to IDP, no viability assessment, and no feasibility/masterplanning of SGS growth location recommendations.</p>
Q44	Beth Foster [4057]		<p>While I recognise that new homes are needed I object to the significant number proposed for Balsall Common. Such huge changes to our area will drive current residents away and change significantly the character of our village.</p> <p>Your questionnaire asks for comments on individual sites - this only achieves a situation where individuals object to development in their area and agree to other site development. This is not an appropriate or reasonable approach, as residents are generally not sufficiently technically knowledgeable about developmental arguments and leads to emotional responses which will no doubt be ignored.</p>
Q44	BFNAG (Mrs F J Wheeler) [5107]		<p>Before the next iteration of SMBC's DLP work needs to be undertaken to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * ascertain that a by-pass for Balsall Common is necessary and traffic flows east/west as well as north/south need to be established. * Confirm Balsall Common can provide for a 50% increase in population, and once Barratt's Farm is fully developed, potential doubling the number of households * Confirm that the loss of Green Belt, in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap, is unavoidable
Q44	Bill Young [6058]		<p>Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.</p> <p>Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Birmingham City Council (Mr Martin Dando) [5352]		As a key stakeholder in the development of the UK Central Hub, Birmingham City Council support the approach being taken particularly in relation to land at Arden Cross and at the NEC and the promotion of the site for high quality, high density mixed use development. The delivery 2,500 dwellings at the NEC within the plan period will be subject to market conditions
Q44	Cannock Chase District Council (Sarah Jones) [2379]		Consultation does not seek to revise contribution towards the wider HMA shortfall. Support previously expressed for the 2,000 homes contribution alongside objections about lack of clear justification for maximum figure. Reference made to potential to revise the 2000 figure at Submission stage. A major concern is that this fundamental issue will only be revisited in later formal stages of process. Concern that this will mean that there is limited scope to fully and genuinely reconsider figure and test SGS findings. Other authorities actively considering options for addressing shortfall. Concerns about implications for Cannock Chase SAC remain relevant.
Q44	Carole Beattie [5601]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Catherine Langton [3384]		Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association (Mr D Cuthbert) [2214]		The Plan needs to reposition discussion of Site 16 into the chapter on Hampton-in-Arden and Catherine de Barnes, following changes to Parish area in April 2019. Sites 12, 85, 96, 106 and 143 in Appendix E indicates no Parish, but will be in Hampton in Arden from April 2019. Chapter 7 Hampton in Arden and Catherine de Barnes Refers initially to both settlements, but subsequent paragraphs refer to village in singular creating uncertainty about which village is being referred to.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Cheswick Green Parish Council (Mrs M Zizzi) [2095]		<p>Cheswick Green PC is extremely concerned that its comments are not being taken into account and that this will ultimately lead to the erosion of the Green Belt in the area.</p> <p>PC reaffirms and reinforces their opposition to the amount of development proposed for the area including Site 12.</p> <p>Consultation document confusing, as not clear how much of SHELAA Site 122 is being considered in site selection document.</p> <p>Text in Site Selection Document about SHELAA Site 122 ends mid-sentence.</p> <p>Consultation document does not properly consider Site 12 in the description.</p> <p>Concerned that traffic impacts were not fully assessed before consultation.</p>
Q44	Chris Moore [6291]		<p>Surely the best solution to developing more houses has to be around the airport and the new Birmingham interchange HS2 station!! Where the infrastructure can be built from scratch roads big enough etc plus people won't need cars as much around there because of the 2 train stations and more than ample bus services.</p> <p>Surely building as many houses apartments around the Birmingham NEC complex is the answer specially with all the leisure activities and transport options.</p>
Q44	Christine Allen [6230]		<p>Objection to SHLAA site 54 Clopton Crescent Depot</p> <p>Whilst I am supportive of the redevelopment of brownfield sites in order to meet housing demand, I cannot support the loss of this facility, comprising the Family Tree Club, a memorial and a grass cutting area, which is so well used by the community. Loss would conflict with NPPF/Local Plan policies to promote healthy and safe communities/health and well-being. It should be improved by the Council rather than taken away from the community. I hope you decide to remove the allocation from you Draft Local Plan.</p>
Q44	Christopher Read [6267]		<p>During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition.</p> <p>Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Christopher Fellows [6118]		Comments on green sites: Site 1: Springhill, 443 Station Road Balsall Common. Step 1 priority 5 in Methodology and despite commentary indicating limited size and existing constraints meaning site may more suitably come forward if wider alterations to green belt pursued, rated green in Step 2.
Q44	Councillor Chris Williams [2087]		Site 3 - Simon Digby site (site reference 232 We have concerns at the inclusion and sheer scale of this site. Loss of this site will significant impacts on biodiversity and on recreational use for nearby residents. We are also concerned that a new road accessing the site would have further impacts still. We are disappointed that this site has not been open for consultation as the whole Local Plan should be open for review. Past decisions do need revisiting when the Plan is reviewed so the whole Plan can be considered - not just those selected for this consultation
Q44	Councillor Chris Williams [2087]		Site 5 - Chester Road/ Moorend Avenue We are comfortable with the removal of this site from the Plan
Q44	Councillor D Bell [2235]		Concept Masterplans Good idea but need much more work especially in guarding development from existing gardens.
Q44	Councillor M McLoughlin [2631]		Some questions unclear. Some questions unrealistic. Number of questions excessive for some residents. Breaking down into segments is good approach. Though can be restrictive. Some residents would rather write in. Solihull masterplan should have been included. Thank you again.
Q44	Councillor M Wilson (Councillor Mark Wilson) [5672]		At present, as outlined by Cllr Max Mcloughlin in March 2019 at a Managed Growth session, SMBC has less than 10,000 units classed as Social Housing stock. Clearly, the present and past housing allocation schemes have failed to provide social housing to meet demand. Now we have a shortage; a crisis. SMBC needs to urgently address this shortage. Areas in the rural South of the Borough need to take up the shortfall, as well as the LEO wards, Shirley and the densely populated North. SCH needs the means to build more homes. Community schemes should also be supported.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Councillor T Hodgson [2532]		On balance, we conclude that the Draft Local Plan does not meet the needs of the whole population, sacrificing our Green Belt without sufficient compensatory provision demanded from the new NPPF. Shirley is targeted with too high a number of new homes without the infrastructure to sustain this, whereas other parts of the borough are not taking a fair share of the housing targets the government has set. Council should challenge WMCA to do more to develop derelict/brownfield sites and reduce pressure on green belt.
Q44	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Strategic Land and Property Team of SMBC (acting in the Council's capacity as land owner) [6043]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	Release of this land provides opportunity for development, alternative to residential use, to help meet development needs of the Borough. Site PO5 is based in a central location of Chelmsley Wood with existing road infrastructure connecting the site along the A452 to M6 junction 4 and M42 junction 7A. Site is within walking distance of the following services and amenities, Chelmsley Wood Town Centre, a bus stop for 4 services to Birmingham, Kingstanding and Solihull. Marsden Green train station, Birmingham Airport and train station are within 3 miles of the site. Due to the sites close proximity to an established road network, local facilities and services, along with the low grade Green Belt land surveyed as part of the supporting evidence to the Draft Local Plan Review (DLP, 2016), it is considered to be a sustainable location for development. The site has a green belt score of 5 (worse performing) in terms of GB accessibility.
Q44	Cushman & Wakefield on behalf of Strategic Land and Property Team of SMBC (acting in the Council's capacity as land owner) [6043]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	Supports site allocation 20 Land at Damson Parkway - site is currently partially used for commercial and industrial purposes including Jaguar Land Rover. Allocation of the site will provide a central, sustainable location for commercial and industrial use. SMBC ownership extends to 43.59ha south of site 20 and the Council is keen to work with other landowners to develop a comprehensive master plan. Part of this land benefits from planning permission for a despatch area for JLR. The allocation of site PO20 Damson Parkway for commercial development is policy compliant and therefore justifiable to help SMBC meet commercial land use needs across the Borough
Q44	David Langton [3382]		Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Diane Langton [3380]		Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Edward Fraser [4138]		Where possible in Solihull Town area instead of building luxury apartments build affordable apartment accomodation to facilitate first time buyers not pushing retirees all the time.
Q44	Environment Agency (Jane Field) [6302]		UK Central Hub Site 19 - HS2 Interchange Site, Solihull The Holywell Brook, a designated Main River flows through the centre of the site with associated Flood Zones 2 and 3. In light of this the Sequential Test should be undertaken to demonstrate there are no alternative sites available at a lower risk of flooding. A level 2 SFRA should be undertaken to support this allocation. All development should be located outside of Flood Zone 2 and 3 as shown on the SFRA Climate Change Maps. A minimum 8m easement should be maintained along the banks for essential flood risk access and provision of a green and blue corridor. Site 20 - Lane either side of Damson Parkway, Solihull An ordinary watercourse (Low Brook) forms the eastern boundary of the site however our 'Flood Map for Planning' only shows the flood risk from watercourses with a catchment area greater than 3km2, mapping of the risk from the watercourse has not been undertaken and as such this is the only reason the site is shown to lie in low risk Flood Zone 1. The assessment of flood risk and easement from the ordinary watercourse should be agreed with the LLFA, however we strongly recommend that hydraulic modelling of the watercourse is undertaken as part of a Level 2 SFRA to inform of the developable area and capacity of this potential allocation. Regardless of flood risk, we recommend an unobstructed green corridor is maintained along the banks of the watercourse for the purposes of protecting and maintaining green and blue infrastructure.
Q44	Ferdous Gossain [5606]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2
Q44	Frances Friel [4156]		I think SMBC should be looking at ways to provide more affordable housing for first time buyers - this certainly would not be the case at the proposed site 18. Two of my children have had to leave the area in order to buy a property within their budget.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Francoise Read [6268]		<p>During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition.</p> <p>Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.</p>
Q44	Gillian Griggs [3964]		<p>Supplementary Update does not revisit Spatial Strategy. Both the HMA shortfall contribution and the alternative considerations raised by the Strategic Growth Study necessitate revisiting the Spatial Strategy. It is unacceptable to leave these fundamental issues to Submission stage.</p> <p>Assessment excludes a number of smaller sites from the Sustainability Appraisal. Strategy continues to focus only on large-scale Green Belt releases around KDBH inconsistent with government advice that a mix of sites be encouraged. Smaller sites should be reassessed to see if they could contribute to housing growth in a more sensitive way with less overall impact on the Green Belt/local character.</p>
Q44	Gina Ready [3393]		<p>South Shirley seems to be the soft target in this planning. We have had the sprawling Dickens Heath conurbation foisted onto us and it has grown beyond what we were told it would be.</p> <p>The council say they are concerned about traffic pollution...have they even come onto Tanworth Lane and the surrounding roads at peak times??</p>
Q44	Gladman Developments (Mr Craig Barnes) [6041]		<p>Gladman is unable to conclude with any reasonable degree of certainty that the supply proposed through the Local Plan is deliverable. This is due to the absence of site-specific information regarding the timescales for delivery. The Council should publish a Housing Trajectory before it submits the Local Plan review for examination</p>
Q44	Greig File [6082]		<p>I do have concerns that most of the dwellings proposed seem to be at extreme limits of the borough, in areas that could potentially be "cut adrift" into other boroughs or authorities.</p> <p>I sincerely hope this is not a ploy to palm off undesirable developments into places that may get reassigned away</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Halford Holdings [6229]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	St. George and Teresa School, site 155, is currently in educational use therefore an alternative site for would need to be found before this site could be released for residential redevelopment. Safeguarded land should be identified and removed from green belt to meet future need and avoid need to alter green belt boundaries in review. Evidence behind Review flawed, no detailed landscape assessments of preferred/amber sites, no revision to IDP, and no feasibility/masterplanning of SGS growth location recommendations.
Q44	Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council (Julie Barnes) [2096]		The Plan needs to reposition discussion of Site 16 into the chapter on Hampton-in-Arden and Catherine de Barnes, following changes to Parish area in April 2019. Sites 12, 85, 96, 106 and 143 in Appendix E indicates no Parish, but will be in Hampton in Arden from April 2019. Chapter 7 Hampton in Arden and Catherine de Barnes Refers initially to both settlements, but subsequent paragraphs refer to village in singular creating uncertainty about which village is being referred to.
Q44	Hampton-in-Arden Society (Victoria Woodall) [5807]		Following the Governance Review in Hampton-in-Arden, all references to Site 16 need to be moved and included within the Hampton-in-Arden section. This site must now also be considered within the context of the infrastructure and rural environment of the Hampton-in-Arden Parish Council Area. With references to sites 12, 85, 96, 106, and 143, the parish segment for these sites has been left blank. These sites will fall within Hampton Parish from April 2019. The Plan should recognise the multiple threats posed against the Meriden Gap by HS2, M42 Junction 6 and MSA.
Q44	Hannelore Lloyd [6260]		The proposed new housing would almost double the size of the village and this combined with the construction of HS2 and the proposed bypass would change the character or the village.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Helen Blyth [3350]		DLP Sustainable Economic Growth chapter lists 11 'Challenges and Objectives Addressed by the Policy'. These are not currently being met: 1. Sustaining the attractiveness of the Borough for people who live, work and invest in Solihull: Urbanisation of greenfields 2. Securing sustainable economic growth: Parkgate never fully occupied 3. Climate change: Increase in traffic 4. Increasing accessibility and encouraging sustainable travel: Public transport services reduced and cycle infrastructure inadequate 5. Improving health and well-being: Loss of greenfield land 6. Protecting and enhancing our natural assets: Brownfield land opportunities remain 7. Water quality and flood risk: Growth will exacerbate flooding.
Q44	Helen Blyth [3350]		Why does Shirley have to absorb 38% of proposed allocations? Solihull is expected to provide extra housing which may be required for people to use the proposed HS2 interchange station. Suggest that any houses required to service this development are allocated nearer to the HS2 hub, to avoid further congestion problems with commuters driving across the Borough to reach UK Central Hub area
Q44	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Harris Lamb Planning Consultancy (John Pearce) [6261]	Need to address contribution to wider HMA shortfall, as current figure arbitrary and yet to be agreed, and carries little weight. Any change in numbers potentially requires change in range/number of sites, so additional sites likely to be required. Council should seek views on potential of sites currently discounted. May require change to spatial strategy to ensure sound. Issue of safeguarded land not addressed. Further green belt land likely to be required in next review, so land should be removed from green belt and safeguarded for future needs to avoid future green belt changes and comply with NPPF.
Q44	Heyford Developments Ltd [3815]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	Fulfilling the Duty to Cooperate will require the Council to reach agreement with the other authorities throughout the HMA on how it can assist in accommodating an appropriate portion of the unmet housing needs from across the HMA. Responses from North Warwickshire Borough Council/Coventry City Council to the Draft Local Plan consultation in 2016 raise concern over how Solihull are addressing their contribution to the HMA shortfall. North Warwickshire Position Statement demonstrates that concern over lack of agreement. Solihull well placed to deliver significant proportion, and failure to do so will result in unsound Plan.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Highways England (Ms Catherine Townend) [5563]		<p>In order to provide a meaningful indication of the impact of the local plan on the SRN, a transport evidence base is required. The impact of the local plan on the SRN can be considered in five key areas. These would be expected to consider the cumulative impact of development in the area and planned infrastructure improvements including possible new Motorway Service Area(s).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * The impact of development in Shirley and Whitlock's End will likely require assessment of M42 Junction 4 and to a more limited extent M42 Junction 3; * Dorridge and Knowle developments are anticipated to primarily impact M42 Junction 4 and 5; * Development within Solihull Town Centre is unknown and therefore its impact on M42 Junction 5 is uncertain; * Major developments at UK Central, the NEC and Birmingham Airport and their associated infrastructure improvements will need to be assessed; and * The impact of development at Balsall Common on the M42 and SRN (and A46) within Warwickshire. <p>The cross boundary implications of growth will need to be considered.</p>
Q44	Historic England- West Midlands Region (Mr R Torkildsen) [2478]		<p>Appears to be no reference to the Historic Environment in the UK Central Hub. The scale and location of development would affect the setting of a number of important heritage assets. E.g. Park Farmhouse (Grade II*) and numerous designated heritage assets within proximity including the Packington Hall Estate (Grade II*).</p> <p>Important for the Plan to consider and positively address the direct and indirect impact on these assets and their setting.</p> <p>The Council's Heritage Impact Assessment will help inform an appropriate design response to accord with national policy and legislation in relation to the historic environment and the delivery of sustainable development.</p>
Q44	IM Land [3900]	Stansgate Planning LLP (Mrs Rachel Best) [2448]	<p>Site Selection Topic Paper.</p> <p>Does not explain how rural settlements split between significant expansion and limited expansion. Dickens Heath and Cheswick Green included for significant expansion despite no secondary school and poorer accessibility in Accessibility Mapping, whilst Meriden highly accessible and has a wide range of services so should be identified for significant expansion.</p> <p>There is no definition of limited/proportionate expansion. Site 10 would amount to c7% increase, so including Site 420 would only be c14%.</p> <p>Mineral Safeguarding Area for Coal</p> <p>Should be removed as no longer relevant, following closure of Daw Mill and re-opening not viable.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Fiona Lee-McQueen) [6265]	<p>Overall IM is pleased that Solihull Council is progressing the LPP and inviting comments on their proposed approach.</p> <p>IM is keen to see a more holistic approach to and consideration of the key factors to be addressed within the DLP. In particular, a more comprehensive approach to housing needs at both the local level and in terms of accommodating a proportion of unmet need from within the wider HMA.</p> <p>Important that these factors are addressed so that the Council can be satisfied that the quantum of land they are seeking to identify and spatial strategy are sound.</p>
Q44	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	<p>IM owns and manages Mell Square shopping centre, which occupies a 5.3 hectare site in Solihull Town Centre.</p> <p>Changes in the retail market means there is a major potential opportunity to redevelop Mell Square as part of a comprehensive masterplan for the revitalisation of the Town Centre to protect its prosperity moving forward.</p> <p>IM is pleased that the Council has recognised there is opportunity to 'restructure' Solihull Town Centre through the preparation of a refreshed masterplan which will highlight opportunities for alternative uses and to provide positive opportunity for reinvention. However, IM would like to see greater recognition within the Local Plan of the importance of the opportunity for redevelopment in the Town Centre, and the role that redevelopment can play in meeting the needs of the Borough, including the 'supergrowth' associated with HS2.</p> <p>Through improved connectivity between Solihull Town Centre and the UK Central 'Hub', the Town Centre can continue to thrive and could provide an important contribution towards meeting the ambitions for growth within the Borough as a whole. This will require a more ambitious approach to the redevelopment of the Town Centre, including a detailed review of car parking requirements within the centre and consideration of the opportunity for intensification through higher density development in accordance with paragraph 123(a) of the NPPF.</p> <p>IM is keen to proactively engage and collaborate with the Council to discuss the role the Town Centre can play in the spatial strategy for the Borough, and in particular, the scale of opportunity available through the redevelopment of Mell Square. IM would be interested to understand the Council's timescales for the preparation of a 'refreshed' Town Centre Masterplan and how this will feed in to the preparation of the Local Plan.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	<p>In March 2017, IM secured hybrid planning permission for up to 750 residential dwellings (use class C3), up to 250 'housing with care' units (use class C2/C3), up to 98,850 sq m of employment floorspace and up to 2,500 sq m of ancillary A1-A5 floorspace at Blythe Valley Park. This permission is referred to within the consultation document which confirms that planning permission has been granted for 1,000 homes (750 dwellings and a housing with care development of 250 units).</p> <p>IM is committed to delivering residential development at Blythe Valley Park with the first homes currently under construction and ready for occupation later this year. However, in developing the detailed designs for the residential plots, it is now anticipated that a smaller C2 provision will likely be pursued, meaning there is a potential opportunity for a greater level of C3 residential development at BVP. Whilst this is not yet confirmed, IM would like to ensure that any reference to the allocation of 1,000 dwellings at BVP does not prejudice the opportunity for more than 750 of the 1,000 units allocated to be C3.</p>
Q44	IM Land [3900]	Turley (Ms Angela Reeve) [2615]	<p>Overall IM is pleased that Solihull Council is progressing the SLPR and inviting comments on their proposed approach. However, IM is keen to see a more holistic approach to and consideration of the key factors to be addressed within the DLP, including a comprehensive approach to housing needs (local and HMA), employment needs, the potential implications of HS2 on these needs, and the importance of the future role of the Town Centre.</p>
Q44	J H Barber & Son [6258]	Savills (Miss Rebecca Bacon) [5525]	<p>New site promoted Land South East of Meriden.</p>
Q44	Jean Fleming [3444]		<p>Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.</p>
Q44	Jennifer Archer [4016]		<p>There has been a large amount of development in South Shirley/Blythe including a large number of retirement residences. This will have freed up family homes. This does not appear to have been taken into account. Placing 38% of the housing in an already built up and congested area would be a flawed decision.</p> <p>The Call for Sites and the sites selected has caused a disproportionate amount of housing being allocated to the South Shirley/Blythe area ie 38% of the housing allocation.</p>
Q44	Joanne Liddiard- McGann [3407]		<p>Too many new houses are allocated for Shirley.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	John Dancer [4303]		<p>- Inconsistent reporting in the Plan on issues related to different sites; some offer clear and concise reasons, others skip over infrastructure issues and seem 'thrown in'.</p> <p>- Inconsistent that Draft Local Plan put great emphasis on HS2 and addressing th</p>
Q44	John Dancer [4303]		<p>- Recognise the national need for housing</p> <p>- Recognise lack of brownfield sites in Solihull, but Plan does not address the ample brownfield sites in Birmingham. Plan should support steps being made by Mayor to clean up and develop large redundant brownfie</p>
Q44	John Haynes [5927]		<p>alternative sites</p> <p>The council should consider building on site numbers 76 and 212 at Cornets End Lane (section 15 and Paragraph 405).</p>
Q44	Kate Edwards [3285]		<p>Council proposing to build 38 percent of new housing in Blythe/South Shirley. Will mean a HUGE increase in the number of cars on our already congested roads. Where will always these extra cars go? Furthermore, we will exhaling all the fumes from these vehicles and the area's pollution will significantly increase, which may have a detrimental affect upon our health.</p> <p>Loss of green belt, wildlife. recreational land, impact on well-being. Should focus on brownfield and protect local fields, wildlife and open spaces for future generations.</p>
Q44	Kate Riemer [5550]		<p>The Local Plan has a duty to act on the views of communities. There is no mention of the Berkswell Neighbourhood Plan despite it having reached Submission stage after consultation with residents. SMBC must have regard to the content of that Plan and the outcome of the consultation; specifically, the strong opposition to the 'overwhelming scale of change' proposed. The selection of Balsall Common to meet much of SMBC's housing needs is not supported. It is not a sustainable location for large amounts of new market and affordable housing, which should be focussed in the main urban cores and areas.</p>
Q44	Kate Riemer [5550]		<p>The Recreation Ground off Meeting House Lane in Berkswell is a long established and valuable recreational space and we support its designation as a Local Green Space as proposed in the Berkswell NDP; therefore Site 169 Blessed Robert Griswold should be removed from the LP as a potential development site.</p> <p>The LP should also specifically exclude the development of Site 30 Land rear of 67-95 Meeting House Lane because of its ecological, landscape and historical importance.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Kendrick homes Ltd [6255]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	St. George and Teresa School, site 155, capacity 31 dwellings, is in educational use and no evidence to show suitable alternative site. Should not be included in SHELAA sites calculation for housing supply. Safeguarded land should be identified and removed from green belt to meet future need and avoid need to alter green belt boundaries in review. Evidence behind Review flawed, no detailed landscape/ecological assessments of preferred/amber sites, additional/smaller parcels require assessment for GBA, no revision to IDP, no viability assessment, and no feasibility/masterplanning of SGS growth location recommendations.
Q44	Kier Living Ltd [5867]		Call for Sites reference 341 meets the exceptions to restricting development of sites designated as open space outlined within Policy P20 of the adopted Solihull Local Plan (2013).
Q44	L Adams [5253]		Our local infrastructure will be overwhelmed & the current problems of congestion / state of the roads, horrendous waiting times to see a GP, Dentist, hospital specialists, etc will worsen. Classes in school will soon be over 50 pupils per class. No teacher can teach 50 kids at one go. Parking outside schools is bad now, imagine how it will be
Q44	Landowners Wootton Green Lane [6256]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	St. George and Teresa School, site 155, capacity 31 dwellings, is in educational use and no evidence to show suitable alternative site. Should not be included in SHELAA sites calculation for housing supply. Safeguarded land should be identified and removed from green belt to meet future need and avoid need to alter green belt boundaries in review. Evidence behind Review flawed, no detailed landscape assessments of preferred/amber sites, no revision to IDP, and no feasibility/masterplanning of SGS growth location recommendations.
Q44	Lichfield District Council (Mr Stephen Stray) [5384]		The Local Plan should seek to identify requirement to 2036, which is the end date for the Strategic Growth study, not 2035. The Sustainability Appraisal has not been updated to take account of changes proposed in the supplementary consultation. without agreement through duty to cooperate in respect of how the HMA shortfall requirement is apportioned in the most appropriate way, the SA assessment will not have properly considered suitable alternatives and established the most sustainable strategy.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Lichfield District Council (Mr Stephen Stray) [5384]		<p>There is concern that Solihull is not committed to fully addressing the Greater Birmingham HMA shortfall. The consultation does not provide justification as to how Solihull arrived at the 2000 figure. No regard has been given to the options set out in the further strategic growth study.</p> <p>It is not known if the provision (2000 dwellings) provides sufficient buffer to meet the need of the HMA.</p>
Q44	M Lopez [6014]		I support the development of affordable housing, but more should be done to make sure this is accessed by local young people and younger families, NOT purchasers who then become or who already are private landlords.
Q44	Maria Smith [6290]		<p>Planning for the educational needs of Catholic Children at St George and St Teresa School needs addressing.</p> <p>Local development has been substantial and whilst Local Authority Schools in the area have been increased to meet demand, St George & St Teresa has not. The School has been forced to exclude children in parish and with siblings in the school.</p> <p>The size of our catchment area to include new developments at Balsall Common, Hockley Heath and additional potential impact from Blythe Valley, as well as Knowle & Dorridge demonstrates a need which should be addressed.</p>
Q44	Michael Moran [5681]		Thank you for providing residents with the opportunity top comment Please see attached representation and plan.
Q44	Mr Cooper [6073]	Roebuck Land and Planning Ltd (Stacey Rawlings) [6072]	<p>We wish the Land East of Nailcote Farm to be considered through the Draft Local Plan for allocation to meet the needs of the wider HMA.</p> <p>The Site should be included within the SHEIAA going forward</p>
Q44	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	<p>Evidence lacking or flawed. No detailed landscape or ecological assessments. IDP not updated. No viability assessments. Green Belt Assessment not revisited to re-assess refined parcels to reflect additional green/amber sites.</p> <p>Unclear how wider HMA shortfall contribution calculated, and figure not justified or agreed.</p> <p>No feasibility work on recommendations of Strategic Growth Study. Full potential capacity of Borough for new housing not considered as potential in SGS not objectively tested in accordance with recommendations.</p> <p>Given green belt boundary changes proposed, Plan should identify safeguarded land between urban area and green belt to avoid changes to green belt boundaries in next review.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr P Benton and Mr T Neary [6271]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	St. George and Teresa School, site 155, capacity 31 dwellings, is in educational use and no evidence to show suitable alternative site. Should not be included in SHELAA sites calculation for housing supply. Sustainability Appraisal scores for Call for Sites reference 116 contested. SA10 gives inappropriate weight to Landscape Character Assessment as too broad brush for application at site level. SA11 does not take account of footpath/bridleway access to natural green space. SA16 should be significant positive as delivery within 5 years. Should be 5 not 3 positive (3 significant), 11 not 10 neutral and 3 not 5 negative effects.
Q44	Mr Peter Heeks [5864]		The local people are united in their resolve to oppose the Council's land grabbing strategy which is happening in all the B37 area.
Q44	Mr Russell Blake [6189]		Review spatial strategy. This Plan update / review is characterised by a slow eating up of the green-belt by piecemeal identification of sites for housing. If council want to meet new build targets and they recognise that it is difficult to find land within the Borough which is suitable for development, but which is not green belt what is the council doing, for example as suggested by NPPF in conjunction with others, to identify ways to meet these targets in other locations, rather than lose greenbelt in this way. Para 215 of this document regarding Knowle is not explained. Infrastructure concerns could put severe constraints on Knowle's ability to support large-scale housing development. At the same time these may conflict with the green belt & heritage aims of SMBC's Plan to preserve certain of the characteristic aspects of this village and its physical separation from other parts of Solihull borough.
Q44	Mr & Mrs Michael & Marion Joyce [6254]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	St. George and Teresa School, site 155, capacity 31 dwellings, is in educational use and no evidence to show suitable alternative site. Should not be included in SHELAA sites calculation for housing supply. Safeguarded land should be identified and removed from green belt to meet future need and avoid need to alter green belt boundaries in review. Evidence behind Review flawed, no detailed landscape/ecological assessments of preferred/amber sites, additional/smaller parcels require assessment for GBA, no revision to IDP, no viability assessment, and no feasibility/masterplanning of SGS growth location recommendations.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr & Mrs Williams [6253]	Oakwood Planning Ltd (Mrs Jayne Cashmore) [5447]	Should allocate small sites such as Site 127, to ensure that at least 10% of the housing requirement is met through smaller sites and given the reliance on windfalls and green belt sites, which may be inappropriate development. Particularly important as a number of the larger proposed allocations have multiple land ownerships and delivery may take longer.
Q44	Mr Adam Hunter [3332]		Dickens Heath and Tidbury Green have already taken a disproportionately high share of recent housing development in the Last local Plan allocations.
Q44	Mr Alexander Hamilton [3325]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Mr Andrew Darby [5992]		During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.
Q44	Mr Andrew Darby [5992]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Mr Christopher McDermott [3693]		please mandate improved leisure facilities (both indoors and outdoors)
Q44	Mr D Deanshaw [2226]		Housing growth in Balsall Common suggests need for Inset Study outside process of Draft Local Plan to provide long term planning and critical infrastructure.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr D Edmonds [4808]		<p>During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition.</p> <p>Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.</p>
Q44	Mr D Perks [3399]		<p>During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition.</p> <p>Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.</p>
Q44	Mr Daniel Wilson [5282]		<p>Blythe & Shirley Land r/o 575A to 587 Tanworth Lane, Cheswick Green (ref A1) Enough homes already. Local residents expense. needs to be made easier for the general population to support or object. The letter sent to residents does not explain the intentions of the council and developers. It is not written in a way that residents can understand.</p>
Q44	Mr David Castrey [5966]		<p>I am objecting to the continuing pursuit of housing development of the Simon Digby site in Chelmsley Wood and consequent loss of public green space without <u>consultation with local residents.</u></p>
Q44	Mr David Neal [5868]		<p>Little or no information is available as to the number of dwellings at the 13 storey 'village' at the junction of Hasluck's Green Road and Stratford Road and whether they have been counted as part of the number of dwellings in this Local Plan. The same goes for the development on the Green. Please advise.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr David Patterson [5526]		<p>Green site 163</p> <p>The drawings misrepresent the area actually under consideration.</p> <p>The site is within the Solihull Conservation Area.</p> <p>The complete site is intrinsic to the group of buildings associated with the church which would be irreparably damaged.</p> <p>It is an important site for essential Parish Activities - Garden Parties, Fêtes.</p> <p>Car parking near to the church and the Oliver Bird Hall is essential for its functioning.</p> <p>There is a Badgers' sett in the area.</p> <p>The additional traffic generated by a housing development would be intolerable to residents and users of the Church and hall.</p>
Q44	Mr David Varley [3385]		<p>Making the right decisions now on development and infrastructure could make Balsall Common an enviable location to move to with its easy access to the airport, HS2 and motorway network. Maintaining its desirability requires quality housing development with appreciation of its current assets and future potential. Issues with parking and through traffic would need to be addressed. New facilities are required, a hi-tech hub for young people, a recreation facility with gym and swimming pool and plenty of green space with trees to suit the Arden environment for all to enjoy.</p>
Q44	Mr Derrick Walker [4780]		<p>Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.</p>
Q44	Mr Don Grantham [5489]		<p>I wholeheartedly agree that the dwellings in Grove Road should remain a "washed over" Green Belt and that the land to the north between Grove Road and Knowle centre should be retained as Green Belt to provide a clear boundary to the existing residential area of the village.</p>
Q44	Mr G Wilkinson [4788]		<p>During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition.</p> <p>Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr G Wilkinson [4788]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2
Q44	Mr G Frost [4809]		During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.
Q44	Mr Geoffrey Wheeler [3040]		I recognise that this is a draft plan supplementary consultation and as such may be modified significantly before the formal version is issued. However, I believe it has so many flaws that extensive research and modification is required before it can be reissued. I would expect this version to be extensively challenged by residents and developers alike, and probably by the external examiner.
Q44	Mr J Davies [2104]		Tack SMPC to rethink Maximum use to be made of brown field or derelict sites
Q44	Mr J Stanley [4786]		During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.
Q44	Mr James Hamilton [6038]		there is no mention of the emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan for Berkswell - something we have worked hard on to maintain and preserve the rural character of this area
Q44	Mr John Wilson [3890]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr Jon Sellars [5962]		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are there so many new homes in South Shirley? 2. What are you going to do to support the local transport network that is already overloaded? 3. Why are you removing so much green belt? 4. Why are you not making denser populated housing? 5. Why do you not make it easier for elderly to move thereby freeing up housing stock? 6. Why are you not developing more brownfield sites? 7. Why are you not tackling unoccupied houses?
Q44	Mr Julian Knight MP [2352]		Thankful for the omission of site 13.
Q44	Mr K Hazelwood [6239]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Mr K Millican [4779]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Mr K R Baker [2041]		It would be wrong to overdevelop urban neighbourhood areas, that are reaching exhaustion on many counts. Instead, to provide potential future housing spread across a wide geographical area has the potential to create user friendly and attractive development in places that people would naturally aspire to live.
Q44	Mr K Wintle [2173]		<p>Allocated Site 3 - Simon Digby</p> <p>The proposed development of the simon digby green space will i believe will have a severe / detrimental effect on the Cole bank nature reserve</p>
Q44	Mr Keith Tindall [3020]		<p>In relation to Balsall Common, I am concerned that the high volume of housing proposed will have a serious impact on this rural location, particularly on its infrastructure which is already under pressure.</p> <p><u>Brown field land used by HS2 should be included not ignored.</u></p>
Q44	Mr Kevin Thomas [3122]		Spatial strategy flawed in respect of level of growth proposed for Balsall Common. Failure to consider the aggregate impact and loss of green belt amenity from additional Coventry build and HS2. Insufficient weight given to the poor transport links in the Balsall Common area. The rationale for the excessive burden of development for Balsall Common is not given (1690 new homes vs 3900 existing) when only 900 homes (vs 8000 existing) are proposed for Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr Luke Davis [5879]		<p>Very concerned that his views will be ignored. Local Green Belt will be ruined by developers. The removal of green belt land known as Simon Digby fields would be an abomination on the local wildlife and many animals will be displaced. It is one of the few pleasant areas this side of the M6. Increase in traffic will cause even more chaos at rush hour. Whoever agreed should be ashamed of themselves for considering this land.</p>
Q44	Mr M Trentham [2114]		<p>I understand that other LPAs in the HMA have already rejected the offer of 2000. It would be prudent to allocate sufficient extra sites in this Plan Review to provide additional capacity, to ensure that the Plan is sound, and there is no repeat of <u>what happened last time</u></p>
Q44	Mr Martin Guy [5969]		<p>I object to the Amber site proposal Ref. A4/Site 59 Golden End Farm, Knowle.</p> <p>This would severely impact the character of Kixley Lane and the canal which is an important feature of the historic town of Knowle.</p> <p>Removal of green belt status, paving the way for development, severely impacts an important local amenity in Knowle.</p>
Q44	Mr Michael Harper [1912]		<p>All important in the development of the area is the maintenance of the village character and nobody is going to argue with that. A key factor in this objective is to break the sizes of the individual sites down - lots of small sites rather than one or two big ones - and there is the opportunity to do this in KDBH. There are lots of smaller plots in the area which are suitable for development; these have already been assessed and some already successfully developed - a good example is off Four Ashes Road.</p>
Q44	Mr N Plotnek [5997]		<p>Submits additional site located adjacent to 237 Tythe Barn Lane, Dickens Heath to be allocated as part of site 4. The boundaries of the LWS to the east is incorrectly marked and therefore the Ancient woodland has been misrepresented. Land at Tythe Barn Lane, to north east of allocation is mostly previously developed and could accommodate 10 to 12 dwellings on site. It is separate in character and appearance and does not form part of or contribute to the adjacent woodland or LWS. Site is more suitable than site 405 which has been positively tested against the Council's evidence base. It benefits from high accessibility to Whitlock End train station and an existing car access point serves the land preventing the need to remove any hedgerow. Owner committed to delivery within first five years and is in ownership of park of adjacent woodland therefore would consider compensatory measures to enhance the woodland. Highlights concerns over deliverability of housing in other parcels in site 4</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr N Walters [2802]		Dickens Heath has been overdeveloped and the original design concept has been destroyed. Council has ignored views of local residents and councillors. Size and number of dwellings far exceeds supporting infrastructure. SMBC need to listen to local residents!
Q44	Mr P Phillips [4798]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Mr Paul Joyner [3573]		Issue with the selection of Balsall Common as the recipient of so many new houses - this is significantly greater than other areas, changing the nature of the village. I have not seen a rationale for this distortion. The releasing of brown field sites in Balsall Common, leading to other schemes outside Balsall being stopped, rather than a reduction of Green field development in Balsall itself is telling.
Q44	Mr Paul Watson [5328]		- Opposition to any future development in the Clopton Crescent area. The area was always intended for public recreation, but was overturned without the consultation of the local residents. - Loss of green space - The proposed development (3 storey flat
Q44	Mr Paul Watson [5328]		Any proposals for development on land around Clopton Crescent/Newby Grove are unacceptable on both environmental and community satisfaction grounds
Q44	Mr S C Howles [6237]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Mr Steven Rushton [3211]		The challenge to the original plan came in part from property development companies, revisions in this plan now make green belt land owned by property development companies (eg site 12) part of the new proposal to develop on - I still find this a very strange way to "do business"; surely development is controlled by the council and not property development companies as the motivations of the two should be very different.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr Steven Webb [2960]		<p>Comments about consultation process: Not all owners of Pinfold Road informed about the plans for Site 16. Letters sent out about drop in after the event. This happened last time as well. There appear to be only fairly junior council staff. Why aren't senior council officials/local MP's/Mayor attending. Those saying they would fight to protect the Green Belt. No new discussion on traffic/transport/Medical Centre impacts. Why on masterplans is so little regard paid to existing property owners. No details about fences/mitigation for overlooking/wildlife impacts and mitigation. Should have drop in near each proposal at times working people can attend.</p>
Q44	Mr Stewart Phillips [5500]		<p>I believe the rapid growth of Solihull population in this plan will be a huge strain on the local NHS secondary care and run the risk of increasing waiting times for treatment for the local population. I imagine that lack of adequate infrastructure for a growing population will adversely effect other services, eg police, fire, schools, etc. I fear that this plan concentrates solely on building houses without consideration of the full impact on support services.</p>
Q44	Mr Stuart Woodhall [3638]		<p>Solihull council been asked to take over spill from Birmingham but we just need to remember that Birmingham has more parks than any other City in Europe where Shirley in particular has very little green space especially post the Parkgate development.</p>
Q44	Mr Tony Mann [5612]		<p>Balsall Common - Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.</p>
Q44	Mr William Cairns [3206]		<p>Para.104 Site 19 Ridding Hill- Why the delay in bringing this forward? The draft rightly states that only one NDP in the borough has been completed and approved, for Hampton in Arden. However the draft mentions that for Meriden which is not as far forward as that of Berkswell Parish Council. This is a major omission of evidence that is available to the planners and would provide SMBC with a significant input of up to date valuable data and direct comments/concerns from residents of Berkswell parish. This significant omission MUST to be addressed.</p>
Q44	Mr William McAskie [5577]		<p>I would like to propose another site for development at Bridle Cottage, Rough Close, Tanner's Lane CV7 7DD</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mr. James McBride [6234]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	St. George and Teresa School, site 155, with an identified capacity of 31 dwellings, is currently in educational use therefore an alternative site for education use would need to be found before this site could be released for residential redevelopment. Safeguarded land should be identified and removed from green belt to meet future need and avoid need to alter green belt boundaries in review. Evidence behind Review flawed, no detailed landscape/ecological assessments of preferred/amber sites, additional/smaller parcels require assessment for GBA, no revision to IDP, no viability assessment, and no feasibility/masterplanning of SGS growth location recommendations.
Q44	Mrs E A Seal [4814]		During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.
Q44	Mrs J Bliss [4803]		During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.
Q44	Mrs Katie Wilson [5233]		We live on lawnswood avenue in Shirley adjacent to our long rear garden is freasley close council owned bungalows. There is potential access from freasley to our garden for 4 new bungalows. But the developers says council will not consider selling small pockets of land as short staffed? This seems wrong when chance of council selling land & 4 new needed bungalows could be built?

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mrs A Hazelwood [6240]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Mrs B Stanley [4785]		During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.
Q44	Mrs C Cavigan [4810]		During the 2017 consultation, residents suggested three brownfield sites in Balsall Common at Wootton Green Lane, Lavender Hall Farm and Pheasant Oak farm to the Council as alternatives to site 3 (and also site 2, Frog Lane). However, rather than developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Balsall Common village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. In contrast other settlements have had a reduction in sites (Shirley/Blythe) or none at all (Dorridge). Not fair on village as HS2 will already cause disruption.
Q44	Mrs C Spelman MP [2073]		SHLAA site 54 -Clopton Crescent There has been a residents petition against development of the site and they have also raised the issue of a covenant which is in place to protect it from development. Residents want to retain Green Space for local children and are also concerned about the impact on local infrastructure and services with increased traffic and housing at this site.
Q44	Mrs Debbie Hatfield [3747]		Homes have to be allocated fairly across the borough. The Meriden Gap must be protected. Once it is developed, we will never get it back. Landowners should not be allowed to influence decisions which will destroy our Green Belt. Surely, new areas of development similar to Dicken's Heath are far more acceptable than ruining the areas of current Solihull residents. The council also need to utilise the empty homes in the borough before new homes are built.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mrs Debbie Moseley [5838]		<p>Questions 16, 17, 18 and 26 within the plan. I fully support the arguments put forward of the joint working group from Hampton Parish Council and Catherine de Barnes Residents' Association response to the SMBC Draft Local Plan (\Parish Response to SMBC Draft Local Plan January 2019) submitted on 03.02.2019.</p> <p>I strongly oppose development of site 16: loss of Green Belt; loss of an effective rural gap & defensible boundaries; and the inability of local infrastructure to handle the development.</p>
Q44	Mrs Diane Thornton [3107]		<p>I would like to register my concerns and objections to the current draft local plan.</p> <p>Shirley and Blythe Valley has now 38% of the proposed housing which is more than the lions share and will link many areas together i.e. Cheswick Green, Dickens Heath, & Tidbury Green. All will become just another huge conurbation with no identity</p>
Q44	Mrs Elizabeth Timperley-Preece [3577]		<p>Balsall Common is one of few areas/settlements in Borough that is expected to take the brunt of additional housing, a number that has increased despite objections to the previous level of housing and the impacts of HS2. A village is being turned into a town when other areas of the Borough are unaffected. There should be a more even distribution across the Borough and all areas should be expected to take a reasonable share of additional housing, taking into account their current size and character and the impact that development will have.</p>
Q44	Mrs Felicity Wheeler [3085]		<p>This is a draft plan supplementary consultation and much work needs to be done to ensure the correct decisions are reached. With specific regard to Balsall Common:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * ascertain that a by-pass is necessary regarding traffic flows east/west as well as north/south. * Confirm the infrastructure can provide for at least a 50% increase in population, and this can be put in place prior to building new homes. * Confirm that the loss of Green Belt, in the narrowest part of the Meriden Gap, is unavoidable and will not damage the purpose of Green Belt.
Q44	Mrs Gillian Tomkys [4787]		<p>Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mrs Helen Bruckshaw [2987]		The amount of housing proposed for Shirley seems disproportionate. This should be spread around the borough to minimize the impact and create opportunities for all.
Q44	Mrs J A Howles [6236]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Mrs Jane Starling [3207]		Many of the questions posed in this consultation are too complicated for the average person, e.g Do you agree with the methodology of the site selection policy? and all the questions in the Affordable Housing policy section. It is not easy to find the relevant sections for explanation and not easy to understand them unless you happen to be a town planner.
Q44	Mrs Jennifer K Darby [6284]		Three brownfield sites in Balsall Common were suggested as alternatives to site 2 and 3 in the last consultation. However instead of developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. Other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers (South Shirley and Dickins Heath) and Dorridge has not been allocated any housing sites at all. This does not seem to be a fair distribution. Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements despite support for protecting the Meriden Gap. Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.
Q44	Mrs Jill Hillman [5492]		Grove Road should remain as 'washed over' Green Belt. We do not want it to become an extended inset boundary of Knowle to Grove Road which would make it part of a built up area which would change the nature of the existing and historic area changing the face and community of Knowle.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mrs Karen Allen [6190]		<p>I object to development on green belt land. There are many brown field and derelict sites in Birmingham that should be developed before requiring Solihull to share their housing requirement. Solihull council should make forceful representations on this point.</p> <p>The majority of the roads around the surrounding areas of Solihull are inadequate to cope with additional traffic.</p> <p>The whole character of the area is under threat by the scale of the proposed developments.</p> <p>The preferences specified in the Knowle Dorridge and Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Plan must be taken into account when determining the proposals</p>
Q44	Mrs L Mackay [2577]		<p>The Borough's criteria for social housing includes priority for 'Troubled Families' and victims of domestic abuse. My concern is that currently all the support infrastructure for these families is based in the North of the Borough. The plan mentions no arrangements to bring in such support systems. Current bus time tables means public transport is not available to help these families access much needed support services. This plan reflects the recent rehousing for such families in Meriden who are now looking to return to the North where the support exists and facilities for young people are more readily accessible.</p>
Q44	Mrs Marilyn Jones [5718]		<p>More affordable housing for families.</p> <p>More ares.</p> <p>More infrastructure.</p>
Q44	Mrs Rita Perks [4805]		<p>Three brownfield sites in Balsall Common were suggested as alternatives to site 2 and 3 in the last consultation. However instead of developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. Other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers (South Shirley and Dickins Heath) and Dorridge has not been allocated any housing sites at all. This does not seem to be a fair distribution. Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements despite support for protecting the Meriden Gap. Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.</p>
Q44	Mrs Sally Wilcock [5875]		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 38% of the Solihull Borough to be built in Blyth Ward - unfair allocation - Congestion in the ward and for Shirley - Significant impact on already stretched and chaotic traffic conditions - Limited parking at stations - Pollution - Detriment to fa

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mrs Sheila Cole [5940]		<p>Whilst I believe that the land on Rowood drive, earmarked for housing, needs to be used, I feel that by adding more housing you are exacerbating a large traffic problem. It has always been difficult to exit Rowood Drive at certain times of the day. Since the introduction of the bus lane in Lode Lane, this has become much more difficult. At times it can take 10 mins to exit the road!</p> <p>By building 30 houses on that site it could add 60 more cars, making the traffic problem much worse.</p>
Q44	Mrs Victoria Onions [3752]		<p>Three brownfield sites in Balsall Common were suggested as alternatives to site 2 and 3 in the last consultation. However instead of developing these sites instead of the greenfield sites, they are to be developed in addition. Village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755. Other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers (South Shirley and Dickens Heath) and Dorridge has not been allocated any housing sites at all. This does not seem to be a fair distribution. Development of Site 3 would create the narrowest gap between settlements despite support for protecting the Meriden Gap. Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement.</p>
Q44	Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]		<p>An holistic perspective has not been taken to site allocations across the borough. Whilst acknowledging that Balsall Common was identified by SMBC as a settlement suitable for significant expansion, to increase the housing units from circa 3900 to around 5700 is totally disproportionate.</p> <p>Overall level of growth in settlement is excessive and much greater than proposed elsewhere, with reduction in numbers for Dickens Heath/Shirley and no allocations in Dorridge. Brownfield sites put forward as alternatives to avoid development of greenfield land, not as additional sites. Proposals will impact on air quality and health.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Mrs Wendy Wilson [2102]		Objects to latest proposal to develop three of the brownfield sites proposed by the BARRAGE action group in addition, rather than as alternatives, to sites 2 and 3. Whilst acknowledging that Balsall Common was identified by SMBC as a settlement suitable for significant expansion, to increase the housing units from circa 3900 to around 5700 is totally disproportionate. (7 large allocations including the Riddings Hill site). In contrast, the settlement of Dorridge, which is probably one of the most sustainable settlements in the borough in terms of public transport and local amenities, currently has no site allocations at all. Amber site ref A5 (Blue Lake Road) should be allocated. This is not in line with the GL Hearn report which proposed a new settlement be created around Balsall Common. This had been suggested by the Parish Council but disregarded by the Council. The importance of both the strategic and local separation of the green belt was recognised by G L Hearn. Balsall Common was deemed to be "wholly within an area making a Principal Contribution to Green Belt purposes".
Q44	Ms Anne Stewart [5464]		Balsall Common General - Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	ms Babs Gisborne [5714]		When looking at the whole plan, it is shocking to see how much Green Belt the Council is prepared to give up. I feel the old URBS IN RUR moto for Solihull will be lost as every pocket of green will be eaten up. I am a very disappointed citizen of Solihull.
Q44	Ms Jennifer Cayley [5598]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Ms Joanne Bellamy [5599]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Ms Nicole Geoghegan [5643]		Consultees cannot properly consider, or comment on, the Draft Plans where SMBC's development intentions for The Hub have not been made available. For example, if plans relating to The Hub had been released, it may show that SMBC's new housing aspirations can be met without some of the sites quoted in the Draft Plans being developed (or, at the least, not developed to the density levels set out in the Draft Plans). The failure to disclose the plans for The Hub alongside the Draft Plans is a serious omission that undermines the entire consultation process for the Draft Plans.
Q44	National Motorcycle Museum (Sir or Madam) [2751]	Framptons Planning (Louise Steele) [4592]	Although consultation focuses on housing numbers/updating proposed allocations, important to re-iterate views that the National Motorcycle Museum should be included in the UK Central Hub Area and that Site 19 should be extended south to include NMM site. NMM with major investment planned has substantial synergy with the Hub Area/HS2, as will support business tourism/local economy, safeguard existing and provide additional employment, provides educational/socio-economic opportunities, and optimise the existing cultural asset. There is a lack of land available for development within the urban areas and NMM is brownfield and suitable for development. GBA demonstrates that land lower performing green belt.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Natural England (Ms Hazel McDowall) [6137]		<p>Natural England comments apply to all of the sites and infrastructure requirements.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure - Our comments to Q3 Balsall Common applies to all sites</p> <p>SSSIs and Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) the following should be considered: - does the site allocation make management of nearby SSSI/LWS less viable. e.g. via urbanisation, or lead to severance or isolation of that SSSI/LWS or preclude making future links between the SSSI/LWS and other sites, and whether there are likely to be any air or water related impacts. We encourage allocation of alternative sites if adverse effects cannot be overcome.</p> <p>- Have impacts on protected species been considered? Appropriate mitigation measures should be identified to reduce impacts.</p> <p>Does the allocation enhance biodiversity, delivering net gains where possible in particular: * Enhancement of existing features, especially on-site hedges, wetlands, woods, aged and veteran trees, watercourses and any geological features. * New habitat creation measures. * Proportion of green roofs on commercial buildings. * Bird and bat boxes. * Biodiversity plan for site (or biodiversity incorporated into any scheme for GI/open spaces). * Measures to protect/enhance/link neighbouring/nearby SSSIs or local sites. * Maximise the biodiversity contribution of any SUDS.</p>
Q44	Nigel Cameron [6263]		<p>SHELAA site 163 - The former Rectory & Glebe Land should be withdrawn from the local plan process. It is within a conservation area. Removal of existing occupants would cause great disruption and expense even if suitable sites could be found.</p>
Q44	Open Spaces Society (Mr Richard Lloyd) [5451]		<p>Requirements for green infrastructure are missing from the UK Central Hub section.</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Paul Hamer [3395]		I am delighted that site 13 has been removed from the local plan. The community have worked hard for this result and we need to protect the Green Belt in this area. To have the area designated as parkland or nature reserve with improvements would allow more wildlife to the area. What a fantastic legacy to leave for future generations.
Q44	Paul J Dufrane [4410]		- Quite frightening is that the HSR report into the historic past of Blyth Valley has not been acknowledged by Solihull Council. A Report that could have considerable bearing on future housing. - Shirley and Blyth Valley has 38% of the proposed housing alternative sites
Q44	Paula Haynes [5922]		There are possible alternative sites for building away from this valued piece of Green Belt section 15. & Paragraph 405 e.g site numbers 76 & 212 at Cornets End Lane which could be used for a new settlement.
Q44	Pauline Daniels [3674]		Every effort should be made to use brownfield sites for housing. Shirley has been swamped with more than its fair share of supermarkets and car show rooms making the roads car parks. Car show rooms do not supply parking for its employees causing them to park in residential roads and on hotel car parks. I think other parts of Solihull should now be looked at for housing and leave Shirley with what bit of green belt we have left to enjoy.
Q44	Peter & Elaine King [3262]		Would like to question why there is the need for more new homes in and around Shirley
Q44	Portland Planning Consultants (Mr Philip Woodhams B.Sc., MRTPI) [2415]		The plan is very heavily reliant on two major sites (UK Central Hub and Barratts Farm, Balsall Common) which have uncertainties relating to them. In the case of Barratts Farm it is understood there is a multiplicity of ownership. Whilst the consultation seeks to secure a comprehensive development proposal these are very difficult to put together and I have known long gestation periods whilst this takes place. There is therefore a material uncertainty regarding deliverability which currently would render the plan ineffective and therefore unsound. More reliable sites such as 114 - 118 Widney Manor Road should be allocated.
Q44	Professor David Walton [3795]		Object to scale/distribution of growth resulting in 1750 dwellings/45% increase in Balsall Common, contrasting with reductions in Dickens Heath/Dorridge. Inequitable distribution, on top of HS2 disruption. Council not exercised by residents' concerns regarding identifying alternative sites. No contingency plans for HS2 cancellation, or changes in population distribution.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Rebecca Clare [3956]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	Roy Summerfield [6242]		SHLAA site 54 Land adjacent to Newby Grove and Clopton Crescent. The land is covenanted for recreational purposes in perpetuity and is being used as such by local residents. The Council has not followed the proper procedures to release the land for development

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Severn Trent Water (Elaine Ring) [6241]		<p>Severn Trent Water Response: Sewage Strategy: We will ensure that our assets have no adverse effect on the environment and that we provide appropriate levels of treatment at each of our sewage treatment works.</p> <p>We will complete necessary improvements to increase capacity when sites are more advanced in planning process.</p> <p>Surface Water and Sewer Flooding: Expect surface water on new development to be managed in line with the Government's Water Strategy, Future Water. For new developments we would not expect surface water to be conveyed to our foul or combined sewage system and, where practicable, we support the removal of surface water already connected to foul or combined sewer. We believe that greater emphasis needs to be paid to consequences of extreme rainfall.</p> <p>Water quality Need to take account of EA Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and Safe Guarding Zone policy, EA RBMPs, and Water Framework Directive.</p> <p>Water Supply When specific detail of planned development location and sizes are available a site specific assessment of the capacity of our water supply network could be made. Any assessment will involve carrying out a network analysis exercise to investigate any potential impacts. We would not anticipate capacity problems within the urban areas of our network, any issues can be addressed through reinforcing our network. However, the ability to support significant development in the rural areas is likely to have a greater impact and require greater reinforcement to accommodate greater demands.</p> <p>Water Efficiency We recommend that you consider taking an approach of installing water efficient fittings on new properties. We would encourage you to impose the expectation on developers that properties are built to the optional requirement in Building Regulations of 110 litres of water</p>
Q44	Simon Taylor [4550]		<p>- Full consideration needed for full responses, not simply based upon (100 word limited) summary responses. - Question whether timeframe for consideration and response to consultation is long enough. - Questions limited in certain chapters, not allowing</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Simon Clare [3953]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2.
Q44	South Solihull Community Group (Sylvia Gardiner) [5777]		Smirley is expected to take 38% of proposed new development - which is disproportionate - 24% of this is green belt. Retirement living apartments are not included in housing figure, yet this frees up homes? Developments will adversely impact the ecology of the area Residents wish "previously site 13" to be assured for the future, as an open public space (Nature Reserve/Village Green/Country Park). This area has evidence of important history events dating back to 880 AD.
Q44	South Staffordshire Council (Ms Karen Richards) [6040]		South Staffordshire Council reiterates its concerns on the contribution that Solihull MBC proposes to make towards the evidenced housing shortfall of the GBHMA. The close relationship between Solihull and Birmingham - the primary source of the identified shortfall - justifies a considerably higher contribution. Deferring the Borough's response to the SGS findings to Draft Submission Stage reduces scope for meaningful engagement and consideration of appropriate scale and location of additional strategic growth options. Continuing with the current contribution towards the GBHMA shortfall could introduce the risk that the plan fails in its statutory requirements.
Q44	Sport England (Mr Rajvir Bahey) [5794]		The Council's Playing Pitch Strategy identifies that there is a current and future shortfall in playing pitch provision. In line with NPPF paragraph 96 the Plan should seek to accommodate the need identified though this is not apparent within the proposed allocations.
Q44	St Philips Ltd [6228]	GVA t/a Avison Young (Kate Green) [6227]	Until publication of the Submission LPR and evidence, St Philips does not consider the Council has justified its assumptions on supply, or its position in relation to the HMA shortfall, such that there is a clear need to identify additional land to support the delivery of large-scale sites, and/or to include a review mechanism that will secure additional sites in the event of a failure to deliver. Moreover, the Council must identify areas of Safeguarded Land to meet longer term needs so as to ensure that the green belt boundaries to be set by the Local Plan Review will endure.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	St Philips Ltd [6228]	Lichfields (Mr Jon Kirby) [6054]	Fulfilling the Duty to Cooperate will require the Council to reach agreement with the other authorities throughout the HMA on how it can assist in accommodating an appropriate portion of the unmet housing needs from across the HMA. Responses from North Warwickshire Borough Council/Coventry City Council to the Draft Local Plan consultation in 2016 raise concern over how Solihull are addressing their contribution to the HMA shortfall. North Warwickshire Position Statement demonstrates that concern over lack of agreement. Solihull well placed to deliver significant proportion, and failure to do so will result in unsound Plan.
Q44	Strategic Land and Property Team SMBC [6226]	Cushman and Wakefield (Miss Hannah Bevins) [5251]	Site 20 - land at Damson Parkway Due to the sites close proximity to other established commercial areas and existing road network to major A roads and motorways it is deemed that this site is in a sustainable location for commercial development.
Q44	Summix (FHS) Developments Ltd [4455]	Framptons Planning (Mr Greg Mitchell) [2685]	Non statutory consultation under Regulation 18 contradictory. Seeks to pre-determine spatial strategy via settlement categorisation/site selection matrix. SCI indicates Review should be subject to formal Regulation 18 consultation, which should be next stage, not Regulation 19. SEA process fails to comply with guidance/regulations. Addressing HMA shortfall likely to result in further alternatives that need to be appraised which could have implications for spatial strategy and SA should be undertaken as part of Stage B/Regulation 18. Formal SA Report should have been prepared/consulted on at this stage. Further deficiencies relating to lack of consideration of alternatives to Q01, reasonable site options not assessed, deficiencies at DLP stage not addressed, fails to evaluate significance of impacts against appropriate evidence, cumulative effects/mitigation not considered, green belt land not considered, no flood risk sequential test of proposed allocations, no explanation for selection/rejection of options or overall conclusions of sustainability of different alternatives. no explanation how SA informed SDLP in integrated way, fails to show how representations from statutory consultees/neighbouring authorities taken into account. Fails to assess 75 sites of which 15 identified as green and 9 as amber sites. SA fails to appraise all reasonable alternatives, demonstrate that strategy is appropriate or take into account alternatives. Appendix 1 attached as additional supporting information in connection with this site undertakes a review of the SEA process.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Sylvia Walton [6203]		Our village of circa 3900 homes is now expected to grow by a further 1755, 460 coming from the brownfield sites. In contrast, other settlements within the borough are seeing a big reduction in the proposed housing numbers... . This does not seem to be a fair distribution, particularly with our village also having to deal with the disruption of HS2. Alternative proposal for a new settlement north of Balsall Common needs serious consideration, instead of the significant expansion proposed for the settlement
Q44	Terry & Tracey Hughes [3163]		Distribution of development across the borough is not balanced/fair. Blythe Shirley south area is still bearing the brunt of excessive development of 41% while knowle is 17% Dorridge & Hockley Heath is 7% Meriden 1% & Bickenhill 31%.
Q44	The Coal Authority (Melanie Lindsley) [6068]		I have reviewed the information provided for the Supplementary Consultation and can confirm that we have no specific comments to make.
Q44	The NEC group (Mr John Hornby) [5849]		The NEC Group supports the inclusion of an estimated 2,500 residential units in the UK Central Hub Area over the Local Plan period (page 13). Subject to market demand, it is our view that there is sufficient and appropriate land capacity to bring forward that number of units over the Plan period in the context of the Conceptual Masterplan for the NEC site.
Q44	Turley (Mr Neil Denison) [3477]	Turley (Mr Neil Denison) [3477]	The representations are made on behalf of ALDI Stores Ltd. The purpose of the representations is to provide evidence to support a redefinition of the boundaries of the Green Belt at Balsall Common in order to exclude a brownfield site (Site 172) adjacent to Kenilworth Road, at the northern part of the built area of Balsall Common from designation as Green Belt. A detailed case supporting the proposed deletion of green belt designation as a change to the replacement local plan Proposals Map is provided in the attached document.

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	Urban Growth Company [2668]	Mott MacDonald (Mr Luke Coffey) [6025]	<p>Reiterates commitment and position of the UGC with regard to the UK Central Hub which should be taken into account in preparation of the pre submission version of the local plan. UGC is supportive of the commitment to the UKC Hub in the Draft Plan and supplementary document particularly regarding the sites contribution towards the delivery of homes.</p> <p>Welcomes recognition of development potential of The Hub particularly overarching vision and set of place making principles which will create a distinct place. UGC is developing a framework that will allow landowners to invest and develop their sites but also contribute towards the infrastructure costs. Would welcome recognition of this and findings of updated HGIP and Framework Plan within the pre-submission plan.</p> <p>Is supportive of increase in housing to be accommodated on site. Q02 has been reviewed the UGC agrees with methodology in relation to The Hub. Principles of Policy P1 in Draft are supported and requests that policy provides enough flexibility to develop in a phased manner. Further clarity in the policy on the range of uses to be accommodated would be welcomed. UGC is working with landowners and key stakeholders and would like to provide further information to SMBC to support the development of the policy in relation to this. Requests that the timetable for the pre-submission draft is confirmed to allow UGC to input.</p> <p>Seeks further clarity in P1 on the need to provide high quality place making across The Hub respecting the uniqueness of each economic asset.</p>
Q44	Wendy Cairns [4226]		<p>Need to clearly ascertain that a bypass is essential for Balsall Common with up to date traffic flows and forecasts.</p> <p>Need to include the draft NDP by Berkswell Parish Council as the draft Meriden NDP which is still in its formative state was sighted in the Solihull Draft Plan.</p> <p>Need reassurances that concept plans have some strength and long term validity and that SMBC will insist they are observed by developers.</p> <p>Major concern for residents is that the lack of cooperation between land owners and developers in respect of Barretts Farm could result in a planning disaster for Balsall Common</p>

Reviewing the Plan for Solihull's Future Draft Local Plan – Summary of Individual Representations by Question

Question	Name	Agent Name & Company	Representation Summary
Q44	West Midlands Police (Chief Constable) [5044]	Tyler Parkes Partnership Ltd (Mrs Glenda Parkes) [6022]	The absence of positive references to the need to provide Police infrastructure associated with the UK Central Hub Area and particularly the residential component at Arden Cross and the NEC undermines the delivery of safe and secure development. There should be express reference to the need for financial contributions towards additional expenditure burden placed on WM Police as a consequence of the proposed growth of the Hub Area and wider area generally. Seek engagement in preparation of Concept Masterplans and policy implementation and delivery once Plan adopted.
Q44	Wood PLC on behalf of National Grid (Ms Lucy Bartley) [5172]		see attached letter - comments on site 19 . UK Central Hub/HS2 interchange site is crossed by a high voltage electricity transmission overhead line
Q44	Worcestershire County Council (Ben Horovitz) [6246]		Worcestershire County Council (WCC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the above consultation. As the Local Plan is developed we look forward to ongoing engagement with Solihull as a neighbouring authority on cross-border matters, including transport and education infrastructure. We anticipate that this work will culminate in inclusion of cross-boundary infrastructure in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Solihull, supported by a Statement of Common Ground and Duty to Co-operate agreement between the two authorities.