

Challenges and Choices

Summary of Consultation Responses - May 2009

Solihull Local Development Framework Core Strategy Issues and Options



Solihull
METROPOLITAN
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Preface

At the decision session of the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Regeneration on 22nd October 2008 the local development framework issues and options paper "Challenges and Choices" was approved for public consultation.

We formally consulted on Challenges and Choices throughout December 2008 and January 2009, although consultation and involvement in developing the Core Strategy is ongoing until it is submitted to the Secretary of State.

The Challenges and Choices consultation was the first key milestone in the preparation of the Core Strategy for Solihull. Its purpose was to seek views on the key issues, the vision and objectives for the Core Strategy and options for development.

128 responses were received and these are summarised in this document which the Cabinet Member for Economic Development and Regeneration approved for publication on 26th May 2009.

List of respondents to the Challenges and Choices consultation document

Respondent No.	Name	Organisation
1	John Adams	Drivers Jonas (Manchester)
2	John Pattinson	WMRegional Assembly
3	Jane Field	Environment Agency
4	John Sidebotham	Centro
5	Mark England	Peacock and Smith
6	Meghan Lewis	Tetlow King Planning
7	Andrew Munton	Bellway
8	Barry Coltrini	Lend Lease
9	- -	North Solihull Community
10	Rohan Torkilson	English Heritage
11	Mark Sullivan	CPRE Warwickshire Branch
12	Jonathan Parkhouse	Warwickshire Museum Services
13	Ian Spencer	Dorridge & District Residents Association
14	Philip Rawle	Freeth Cartwright LLP
15	Helen Shute	
16	Nick Small	Fox Strategic Land and Property Ltd
17	Mike Eastwood	Landscape, SMBC
18	Nigel Gough	Bigwood
19	Nigel Gough	Bigwood
20	Philip Brown	Savills
21	Heather Blakey	Barton Willmore
22	Heather Blakey	Barton Willmore
23	Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore
24	Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore
25	Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore
26	Kathryn Ventham	Barton Willmore
27	Gary Stephens	Warwick District Council
28	Peter Horridge	Stansgate
29	Les Morris	National Grid
30	Sarah Burgess	CABE
31	A G Inshaw	
32	G D Symes	Kenilworth Town Council
33	David Rhead	Homes & Communities Agency
34	John Pettinger	
35	Mr C Jagger	Berkswell Society
36	Ivan Parry	
37	Mr M Turner	
38	Erica McDonald	Notcutts Ltd
39	Justin Milward	Woodland Trust
40	K V Potts	
41	Nick Barlow	Packington Estates Enterprises Ltd
42	David Felthouse	Balsall Common Village Residents Association
43	S Phillipson	
44	Geoff White	GW Minerals
45	TP & E-A Machin	
46	R D Evans	
47	Robert Jays	William Davis Ltd
48	Prof. John Child	
49	Beryl Starkey	

Respondent No.	Name	Organisation
50	Anne Byron	
51	David Acton	
52	Caroline Spelman	MP
53	Paul Cooper	
54	Ben Wrighton	Cushman & Wakefield
55	K Riensema	Civil Aviation Authority
56	Amanda Steward	Equality & Human Rights Commission
57	John Stothard	Network Rail
58	Lucy Becque	Baker Tilly
59	Gillian Magee	Community Safety Manager SMBC
60	Judith Keate	
61	Linda Hancock	
62	Christine Hemming	British Waterways
63	Lucy Wilson	Drivers Jonas
64	Philip Woodhams	Philip Woodhams
65	Garth Hanlon	Savills
66	Julie Warwick	Holmes Antill
67	Shaun Denny	Cemex
68	Stephen Hill	Birmingham International Airport
69	Jill Davis	Davis Planning Partnership
70	Jill Davis	Davis Planning Partnership
71	Jill Davis	Davis Planning Partnership
72	Jill Davis	Davis Planning Partnership
73	Jill Davis	Davis Planning Partnership
74	Jill Davis	Davis Planning Partnership
75	Sheila Wyldebore-Smith	Berkswell Parish Council
76	Phil Ward	Warwickshire Community Council
77	Fiona Harrison	
78	Charles Robinson	CDS Development Services
79	Eva Neale	Warwickshire CC
80	Carole Picken	Bickenhill PC
81	Paul Thandi	NEC Group
82	Samantha Nicholls	Leith Planning
83	John Sammons	Tyler Parkes
84	John Sammons	Tyler Parkes
85	John Sammons	Tyler Parkes
86	John Acres	Catesby Property Group
87	John Turvey	Dickens Heath Community Association
88	Robert Cawte	Keep Shirley Alive Residents Group
89	Robin Moxon	Goodman
90	Rachel Best	Rachel Best
91	Rachel Best	Rachel Best
92	Joanne Hedgley	Pegasus Planning Group
93	Nicola Sewell	Indigo
94	Alasdair Jones	Stoneleigh Planning Partnership
95	Alasdair Jones	Stoneleigh Planning Partnership
96	Alasdair Jones	Stoneleigh Planning Partnership
97	Alasdair Jones	Stoneleigh Planning Partnership
98	Alasdair Jones	Stoneleigh Planning Partnership

Respondent No.	Name	Organisation
99	Alasdair Jones	Stoneleigh Planning Partnership
100	Glen Langham	Turley Associates
101	William Kumar	Turley Associates
102	Brian Jameson	CTC
103	Elaine Williams	Green Party
104	Stephen Holt	Solihull Cycling Steering Group
105	A R Leight	Marston Green Residents Association
106	Rachel Bust	The Coal Authority
107	Karen Rose	GOWM
108	Zoe Auckland	RPS Planning
109	Rose Freeman	The Theatres Trust
110	David Thompson	Sunderlands & Thompsons
111	D A Thompson	
112	Richard Cobb	
113	Alan Chadwick	National Express Bus & Coach
114	G Fyles	Tarmac Ltd
115	Kate Anderson	indigo
116	Fergus Thomas	Barton Willmore
117	Neil Hansen	Highways Agency
118	Elizabeth Mellett	Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners
119	Alan Martin	Councillor SMBC
120	Mark Pearce	Advantage West Midlands
121	Tim Wade	Bromford Group
122	Katie Judge	Community & Economic Regeneration SMBC
123	Julie Hall	Meriden Parish Council
124	Ian Roxburgh	Meriden Parish Plan Steering Group
125	Councillor Summerfield	Birmingham City Council
126	Allison Crofts	Natural England
127	Clive Margetts	Gemstone Financial Management LTD
128	Neil Warner	John Phillips Planning Consultancy (JPPC)

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
1	More on transport issues needed. Should focus on improving public transport on key routes.			Support retaining Green Belt, but some development could be accommodated without damaging openness of Green Belt. Review of Green Belt needed.		Ruling out growth in all villages especially Hockley Heath is overly restrictive. There are opportunities in the higher value parts of the Borough to release land to meet specific housing needs. Respondent is promoting land at School Road, Hockley Heath.
2					Option 1 is considered to be consistent with the WMRSS. Options 2 and 3 would be contrary. There is no specific need for urban extensions in Solihull and this would undermine urban renaissance objectives.	The Centres Policy Lead has commented and verified that the document raises no conformity issues. Any further development at Chelmsley Wood and Shirley will need to be consistent with policy 12B of the WMRSS Phase 2 Revision.
3	Right key issues. No issues missed but need improvement to green infrastructure including improvements to links for habitat migration and for mitigation of climate change impacts.	Right Vision. No changes needed.	Right objectives, subject to comments. None missed but need to include mention of deculverting and watercourse restoration. Missed some objectives / key issues links.	Right policy principles. None missed but with regard to carbon emissions, clear targets are needed for site renewables. Protecting & delivering quality in built environment should also include the natural environment.	Preference for the Option which is the most sustainable, allows for public transport, reduces flood risk and allows for climate change.	
4	Additional capacity for bus service access in key local centres is needed now.	Right Vision.		Welcomes & supports the identified policy principles. A specific individual policy on 'Accessibility and public transport' is needed.	Combination of all 3 Options is likely to provide the most appropriate development in terms of promoting sustainable developments that are well serviced by public transport. Capacity of existing public transport will need to be assessed under Option 1. Green Belt sites may not be well served by public transport under Option 2. Option 3 needs to ensure that rail services are supported by bus services, especially at Balsall Common where bus services are poor. In favour of growth at Dickens Heath / Whitlocks End station where the location could support intense development.	When preferred option is adopted, ensure that necessary package of improvements and transport infrastructure is put in place. Land should be safeguarded for strategic transport corridors and intensive development should be directed to places already well served by public transport.
5						Take a positive approach to new retail development. The next stage should confirm the hierarchy of retail centres.
6	Right key issues. Need for small properties and affordable housing and extra care housing. Meeting the needs of the elderly should be a key commitment.	Right Vision. Should make reference to mix of housing type and tenure.			Need evidence base before choosing an option. Further work needed following completed SHLAA and SHMAA. Should have option including urban extensions and rural exception sites. Concentrating growth in urban areas may not meet housing requirements. Also need Green Belt review.	Core Strategy should include - Affordable housing weight and status; Set district and sub-district housing targets; Local definition of affordable housing; Sequential approach to Brownfield sites should not impede affordable housing delivery; Target sites for affordable housing, including 100% affordable and rural exceptions sites; Recognition of benefits of working with Registered Social Landlords; Flexible approach to S106 Agreements.
7	Development of Green Belt for regeneration and North Solihull Regeneration should be in the key issues.			Policy principle on carbon emissions - Government timetable should be accepted, not shortened. Focus not just on new housing but all new and existing development.	Options 2 and 3 are flawed if assume high densities of the past. North Solihull should be released ahead of urban extension.	Flats are no longer sustainable and this will affect densities and numbers. More land is likely to be needed at lower densities. Sites should be released sequentially: regeneration zone and brownfield, then green field, then urban extensions.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
8	Right key issues.	Right Vision. Solihull town centre should be more directly reflected in the vision.	Right objectives. More detailed set of objectives underpinning economic assets is missing. New objective for redevelopment of Mell Square and expansion of Touchwood.	Need to explicitly identify Solihull town centre as principle focus for higher order shopping.	Solihull town centre needs to remain the focus for continuing economic, social and community activity, irrespective of spatial scenarios.	Identifies possible land for development in Solihull Town Centre.
9	Mainly right key issues. Affordable activities for youngsters - legally run motor/quad bike park.	Almost the right Vision.	Mainly right objectives. Youngsters need to be allowed to be youngsters. Schools/job centres to encourage community involvement.	Closing North/South divide should be included. Things for youngsters to do. Free swimming for kids.		Children to be allowed to be children. Classroom sizes are too big.
10	Need to refer to the historic environment in Issues 5, 14 and 28.	Adjust to include mention of historic environment.	Right objectives.	Ensure a principle is to preserve and enhance built heritage, respecting and responding to historic character, rural and urban landscapes, assets and settings. Transport infrastructure should be well designed to minimise environmental impact.		Maintain the Borough's identity by attention to historic environment.
11	More emphasis on protection of Green Belt. Resist second runway at BIA.	Linkages with Coventry are less important than with Birmingham.		Policy Principles not correct. Disagree with principle 'Maintaining an effective Green Belt' as no Green Belt losses are required to support regeneration. Green Belt locations should not be found for gypsies and travellers. Employment policies are not supported.	Option 1 least harmful. Opposed to Options 2 & 3.	
12	Protecting the historic environment is an issue which has been missed.	Include reference to the historic and natural environment in the Vision statement. Suggested amendments to 5th bullet point of the Vision.			Option 3 preferred. Least favour Option 2 as likely to affect local distinctiveness.	Lack of reference to the historic environment throughout.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
13	Essentially right key issues. Other issues include threat to Green Belt particularly Knowle/Dorridge; Providing right type of housing; Too much weight on Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.	Partly correct. Vision not practicable - prosperity aspirations could encourage inappropriate development. Elements of the vision are unrealistic because of insolvable problems. The Vision is a worthy aim but will fail if based on impossibility.	Right objectives. Need increased accessibility on foot/cycle.	Policy Principles not correct. Need to ensure a distinction between Green Belt function and amenity. Need to address lack of houses for downsizing and resist tendency for smaller housing.	Recognition that satellite villages should not be developed.	Major extensions require proper consideration of infrastructure. Need green space considerations. Protect the most at risk Green Belt and protect villages from merging.
14	Support managing the Borough's waste and exploitation of existing energy sources, but should go further. Need balanced approach to housing growth outside Green Belt.	Vision is correct to a degree. More emphasis needed on Solihull as a location rather than within the Region/sub-region. Deal more with North/South divide. Balanced approach to housing growth and affordability. Reduce waste generated. Increase recycling. Increase renewable energy sources.	Amend waste objective to "reduce waste and increase recycling". Objectives to: Increase affordable housing; Provide balanced approach to housing growth within Green Belt. Promote renewable energy sources. Reduce waste & increase recycling.	Managing waste should make reference to recycling, waste reduction and encourage materials recovery facility. Within 'Maintaining an effective Green Belt' the distinction should be made between developing brownfield/greenfield land with a clear preference for previously developed land.	Option 3 is preferred but still somewhat below NLP higher housing options. Small village growth should not be ruled out particularly in Hampton-in-Arden and Catherine-de-Barnes. Options 1 & 2 are far too limited to meet additional housing growth. Extensions to Dickens Heath and Balsall common supported.	Proposed growth options would not meet affordable housing needs for Borough. None of the proposed growth options mention waste management & how reduction of waste to landfill coupled with increase in recycling will be managed & delivered. If not addressed will hinder development within Borough.
15					Option 1 preferred. Option 3 is not supported as Dickens Heath already has traffic problems and poor public transport links. Would also erode Green Belt.	
16	Right key issues, but could have been grouped thematically. No issues missed.	Right Vision. No change needed.	Right objectives. Need to include an explicit aim to ensure access to high quality housing for all sections of the community. Need improved availability of housing supply across all tenures, prices, sizes.	Right policy principles. None missed. No changes needed.	Option 3 preferred. Option 1 lacks flexibility to deliver housing. Some urban and settlement extensions are supported but respondent also outlines other opportunities e.g. Tidbury Green. Extension to the south of Shirley is not supported, neither is extension to the east of Solihull town centre.	Need for evidence base - SHLAA, assessment of Green Belt before preferences identified; need to allow for emerging sustainability codes which will become mandatory during life of LDF.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
17	No mention of cleaner, safer, green communities, threat to open spaces, green spaces, making the best use of resources, not working against nature. Incorporate sustainable buildings and infrastructure.	No mention of access/ biodiversity/ functioning ecosystems and processes. No mention of adaptation to climate change.	Missed objectives include: protection and enhancement of river corridors; maximising potential of rural-urban fringe; establishing strategic green links between urban green space and countryside; sustainable use of water for recreation; affordable rural housing; establishing strategic asset management. Need to promote, conserve and enhance the special character of Solihull.	Need to mention cleaner, greener, safer communities. Add 'protecting and delivering quality in the landscape'. Consider back-land policy, development should create and enhance a distinctive character that relates well to surroundings and supports a sense of local pride and civic identity.	The River Cole is of fundamental importance to the region's overall environmental quality. Solihull's countryside should be protected and enhanced, not encroached on and degraded. Option 1 should improve quality of green space. Option 2 could increase traffic on already congested roads. Option 3 development around Marston Green could result in a loss of green space. Need to consider settlements with public transport links and seek to improve them.	
18	Not right key issues. Key issue required for housing for elderly and greater affordable housing.	Vision is not right. Needs strong reference to needs like housing for elderly and greater affordable housing.	Objectives not right. Needs strong reference to needs like housing for elderly and greater affordable housing.	Do not meet housing needs, especially for the elderly.	No Options properly look at the opportunity to round off Knowle / Dorridge. Disregarded before SHLAA and settlement study prepared.	Providing right type of housing is not just affordable extra care housing but also nursing homes by provision of care villages in sustainable locations. Respondent is promoting land at Smiths Lane / Browns Lane.
19	Should be a key issue to support BIA in developing in and close to airport, not just in the airport.	Vision generally right subject to more support for employment provision close to airport.	Objectives generally right but need to make provision for further land and development to build on the economic success of the Borough - a bolder approach is required.	No reference made to need for increasing range and type of employment provision in the Borough and sub-region. Additional employment land needed particularly close to BIA. Also new employment provision close to Land Rover to support it.	None of the Options provide new employment growth to support BIA and Land Rover.	Does not fully consider future employment provision to support BIA and Land Rover. Respondent is promoting land in Old Damson Lane.
20	Key issues do not fully reflect challenges facing the Borough in relation to housing.		Objectives broadly agreed with, but housing objective not sufficiently explicit.	Principles do not convey how policies will address key housing issues of need and affordability. Review of Green Belt boundaries is required.	Option 1 not supported as would not meet housing requirements and would exacerbate affordability. Options 2 and 3 incapable of responding to housing requirements. Urban extension required. Light Hall Farm considered to be the most sustainable extension identified.	Respondent is promoting Light Hall Farm sustainable location for urban extension.
21	Some overlap between key issues so suggest grouping.	Vision is supported.	Support objectives A, G, L and M.	Support maintaining effective Green Belt but need to allow flexibility where there are very special circumstances.	Support combination of Options 2 & 3.	Identifies land for possible development at Marsh Lane.
22	Key issues should be grouped.	Vision is supported.	Support housing objectives but fail to consider the issue of a need to provide sufficient housing to meet current household projections.	Support minimising carbon emissions. Need also to recognise that affordable housing provision is not always feasible or viable.	Option 1 provides insufficient growth and flexibility. Support Option 2 but scope needs to be widened. Support option 3, ideally combination of Options 2 & 3.	Identifies land for possible development at Warwick Road, Solihull.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
23			Objectives do not address need to provide sufficient housing. Need to meet more local need of communities outside the MUA.	Principle for meeting housing needs should not relate only to affordable housing. Need to consider housing to sustain local services in rural areas. Amendments suggested.	Option 1 not supported. Support combination of options 2 & 3 but need to be flexible to meet housing requirements.	Identifies safeguarded land for possible development at Braggs Farm Lane.
24			Objectives do not address need to provide sufficient housing. Need to ensure affordability gap is not worsened and need to meet needs of communities outside the MUA. Additional objectives are included.	Principle for meeting housing needs should not relate only to affordable housing. Development may be needed to sustain local services. Amended text suggested.	Do not support option 1. Support combination of options 2 & 3 but concerned that Dorridge is not included within the Options as land is available.	Identifies land for possible development at Norton Green Lane, Dorridge.
25			Objectives do not address need to provide sufficient housing. Need to address affordability and meet needs of local communities.	Principle for meeting housing needs should not relate only to affordable housing. Development may be needed to sustain local services. Amended text suggested.	Do not support option 1. Support combination of options 2 & 3.	Identifies land for possible development at Griffin Lane, Dickens Heath.
26			Objectives do not address need to provide sufficient housing. Need to address affordability and meet needs of local communities.	Principle for meeting housing needs should not relate only to affordable housing. Development may be needed to sustain local services. Amended text suggested.	Do not support option 1. Support combination of options 2 & 3. Meriden should be a focus for development.	Identifies land for possible development at Leys Lane, Meriden.
27						Request that an Option for development to the west of Coventry is not rejected, but considered alongside options for development in Coventry and Warwick around Westward Heath, Tile Hill and Burton Green. Should be explored further in partnership, could make a meaningful contribution towards sustainable growth of Coventry.
28	Right key issues identified, but no mention of ensuring that new development contributes towards sustainable development. This should be included in Issue 10.	Vision correct. No changes needed.	No comment.	No comment.	Option 1 most favoured. Dislike Green Belt incursions south of Shirley and westward expansion of Dickens Heath in Option 3. Option 2 bus showcase routes will not absorb increased demand.	Development should be concentrated in North Solihull with limited development to meet local needs elsewhere.
29	Letter of no comment.					No specific comments. Wish to be involved in preparation of DPDs affecting National Grid assets.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
30	No comments but general comments in a letter.					LDFs can secure high-quality development of the right type, in the right place, at the right time. Robust design policies should be included in LDFs and Community Strategy. Officers and Members should champion good design. Treat design as a cross-cutting issue, consider how other policy areas relate to urban design, open space management, architectural quality, roads and highways, social infrastructure and the public realm. Design should reflect understanding of local context, character and aspirations. Include hooks for other design tools and mechanisms.
31	Right key issues. More stringent applications to ecological and historical situations. Changes are required.	Right Vision, but changes required.	Reappraise housing scenario.	Right policy principles. None missed. No changes needed.	Option 1, best of a bad choice. Do not agree with any further incursions into Green Belt creating further urban sprawl.	Overall the plan needs total reappraisal in light of present economic climate. Plan is a conflict between utopia and more building.
32	Letter of no comment.					
33	See comment.					Request that any consultation responses can accommodate emerging joint HCA/SMBC working on housing growth & residential-led regeneration
34	Key issues appear to be comprehensive. "Poor quality links between Borough's green spaces" not clear. Insufficient attention to small villages and settlements.	Vision is right, no changes suggested.	Objectives are right, but rural villages and settlements need to be sustainable and served by public transport. Need objective on the appropriate use of Green Belt and conservation of canals. Some extension of MUA into Green Belt is preferable to development within or beyond, provided it is low density, well planned and has significant green areas. Reliance on development close to railways is poorly founded. Public transport between the south west and north east of the Borough needs improving.	Mainly agreed. Safeguarded land should be developed before Green Belt.	None of the options conform to RSS housing requirements. Rejected options have been dismissed too lightly. Smaller settlements can take their share of development enabling local services and facilities to be supported. Elements of all 3 Options and some of the rejected Options will be required. Extension at Balsall Common would have negative impacts.	
35	Right key issues. Introduce tighter controls of speeding traffic on country roads.	Right Vision. No change needed.	Right objectives but objectives missed. There should be tighter controls on the Birmingham Airport expansion.	Right policy principles. None missed but there should be no development in Green Belt around Berkswell & Balsall Common.	Option 1 preferred. No options missed. Need to maintain the Green Belt, especially the Meriden Gap.	All local parties should be consulted in decision making and development process.
36					Option 1 preferred. Object to extension to Balsall Common	Concerns about development in Green Belt and around Balsall Common village.
37					Missed Option would be to provide infrastructure in small villages to help spread the load of development.	The 3 choices seem to emphasise intensive developments in North Solihull & Shirley whichever choice is made. Shirley is overdeveloped now and concern about loss of open space.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
38	All listed issues are correct to be addressed. Need to maintain strong economic base & maintaining & improving the Borough's economic status within Region should be recognised.	Right Vision, subject to comments. Re-emphasise importance of maintaining strong economic role for Borough within Region. Borough's excellent strategic location on motorway network should be capitalised on to ensure the outside population's and the Borough's population's spending power is encouraged in the Borough. Elsewhere need to provide varied facilities e.g. general retail, leisure, work.	Right objectives, subject to following comments. Maintaining the Borough's main retail centres should not preclude improvement/consolidation of retailing outside centres where this could help underpin strength of offering & economic prospects within whole Borough. There is a place for both in-town and out-of-town retail activity which generally serve different functions.	Support development along strategic transport routes, assessable to all. Support need to provide appropriate mix of high quality housing.	Option 1 will not fulfil housing numbers required by RSS. Option 2 is correct to focus development along key public transport corridors which will assist to attract inward investment & economic benefits. Concept of well linked urban extensions with good accessibility. Option 3 goes furthest towards alleviating congestion, whilst providing higher housing numbers required by RSS but will require significant incursions into the Green Belt.	Development dispersed through each of 3 main centres is likely to lead to imbalance in relation to remainder of Borough & will raise infrastructure issues. Congestion needs to be addressed which option 1 will exacerbate. Demand for rail travel exceeds capacity at peak times, car is chosen to access main centres, so option 3 + reliance on rail to relieve congestion is unrealistic. Option 2 provides sufficient housing numbers in balanced way to meet likely RSS requirement, is most realistic solution to congestion issue & requires less incursion into Green Belt.
39				Pleased to see policy principle seeking to minimise carbon emissions. Widen policy principle on carbon emissions to encompass a broader 'Mitigating and adapting to climate change' principle. Policy for 'Protecting and delivering quality in the built environment' should include the natural environment as well.		Would like to see protection for Ancient and Veteran Trees and accessible new woods close to where people live.
40					Option 1 is the least worst.	SMBC needs to take stock of empty houses & bring them back into use. Object to further expansion of Dickens Heath. Allow for changing employment trends e.g. automotive and related sectors.
41	Mostly right key issues. Rural areas and farmers needs need to be addressed including protection of Green Belt for farming.	No mention of farming and needs of rural areas. Need to mention farming and needs of rural areas.	Mostly, but retaining Green Belt does not mention needs of businesses and conservation. Promotion of the rural community. Need to promote the needs of rural community and maintain and enhance the Green Belt.	Mostly, but effectiveness of Green Belt is dependent on workers, particularly farmers. Promotion of the rural community needs to be addressed as well as success of rural enterprises in Green Belt, employment land in rural settlements as well as the survival of villages and their facilities.	All three have merit but preference for Option 3 with amendments. Concentration in Clusters option on Dickens Heath & Balsall Common only, object to no development proposed in Meriden and Hampton-in-Arden which would help survival of facilities.	

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
42	Right key issues. Infrastructure requirements need to be considered. All areas of Borough to have long term plan regardless of whether they are identified for housing growth.	Right Vision. Commitment to ensure delivery in all areas not just Regeneration Zone.	Right objectives. Sport strategy not included. Rural area development to be implemented sensitively. Resist airport expansion beyond proposed runway and limit to operational requirements. Support high speed rail links to London. Respect character of Borough.	Right policy principles. Inclusion of a Sports Strategy is missed but no changes needed.	Option 2 preferred. Possible new settlement is potential a missed option which should be justified if rejected. Option 1 may be inappropriate to meet any additional housing requirements. Reservations about Option 3 - including infrastructure, character, and accessibility.	Involve Parish Councils and residents associations in decision making process.
43	Right key issues.	Right Vision.	Right objectives.	Right policy principles.	No consideration should be given to development on green spaces. Need to protect and enhance public open space.	Housing in some areas of North Solihull Regeneration Zone going ahead despite residents opposition.
44	Right key issues. Problem of waste & recycling. Recognition of permissible development in Green Belt - minerals.	Right Vision.	Right objectives.	Right policy principles. Mineral resources should not be included within managing waste.	Option 1 favoured. Recognition that certain development can only be undertaken in the Green Belt e.g. minerals.	
45	Right key issues. Too focused on the urban area to the exclusion of rural areas. Insufficient attention to infrastructure, particularly transport.	Too concentrated on the Regeneration Zone.	Right objectives. Too much concentration on urban areas. Transport needs more coverage, particularly rail.		Option 2 preferred. Not necessarily dislike Option 3 but improvements to transport links will be imperative in Balsall Common.	Support increase in size of Balsall Common subject to infrastructure improvements put in at the outset.
46					Disagree with building on Green Belt.	Protect and respect Green Belt.
47			Needs to be a specific reference to meeting housing provision targets.	Concern that renewable energy requirements will influence viability and development and incur significant costs.	Option 1 - Can enough sites be identified? Would also fail to support rural areas. Option 2 - Would have implications for design and character. Needs to focus on rail as well as bus. Option 3 - Agree with dispersal of growth but this does not go far enough.	Question ability of all 3 growth options to meet housing requirements. Need extended version of Option 3 which includes Knowle, Dorridge and Hampton-in-Arden.
48	Right key issues. Improvement to transport to outlying areas and improved services. Recognise attraction of new light industry and home working.	Need emphasis on international links via BIA & attraction of international companies to Borough. Upgrade college to university status.	Missing objective to improve skill and education levels.	Right policy principles.	Option 2 preferred but overemphasis on bus routes, not enough on rail.	Policy principles are appropriate but Council does not always successfully apply them.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
49	Right key issues but need facilities for healthy exercise.	Right Vision.	Right objectives.	Policy for health and exercise required.	Option 3 is preferred but development in Hampton-in-Arden and Knowle and development in East of Borough is missing from the Options.	Pilot study on community leisure facilities and car parking availability will help to feed into the key issues.
50		Vision not right. Need equality over the whole of the Borough.	Objectives not right. Need to look at what people really need to live in the area.		No preference for any Option as Castle Bromwich is not mentioned.	Castle Bromwich has been neglected.
51	Key issues not quite right. Replacing public open spaces lost to development by releasing Green Belt land for recreational purposes is needed.	Vision is mostly right. Need use of more Green Belt land round Knowle/Dorridge.	Objectives not right. Need more selective use of Green Belt land for housing .	Policy Principles not correct. Options only for release of Green Belt land in North Solihull. There should also be controlled growth in South Solihull on Green Belt land.	Should be provision for extension to Knowle/Dorridge. Land between Knowle & Dorridge, Bentley Heath/Four Ashes - ideally placed for transport. As well as land for housing at Widney Manor.	Bentley Heath/Widney Manor area has excellent public transport service as well as 2 train stations which will help to cut carbon emissions.
52					Concern about option 3's incursion into Green Belt.	Consideration of new locations for gypsy and traveller sites. More consideration for primary health care facilities for elderly population. Green transport options for school children (cycle routes, "yellow bus" and walking routes).
53						Consideration should be given to self-build housing, especially in North Solihull.
54	Letter reserving right to comment.					
55	Letter of no comment.					
56	Letter of no comment.					
57	Letter of no comment.					
58					Object to Option 3. Impact on Green Belt, expansion not sustainable and infrastructure will not cope.	Should utilise brownfield sites in Balsall Common before Green Belt.
59	Need to include crime and community safety as a key issue.	Need to incorporate crime and community safety , vulnerable groups and access to homes and jobs for marginalised groups.	Need to add "safe" to public transport, green infrastructure and places to go and things to do related objectives.	Refer to marginalised groups in the principle which seeks to direct new employment to where it is most needed. Also add "safe" to the Town Centres principle.		Issues of community safety and crime reduction should be referred to throughout the document.
60	Right key issues, no changes required.	Right Vision, no changes suggested.	Right objectives, no changes required.	Right policy principles, no changes required.	Option 1 preferred. Dislike any development in Green Belt, particularly in Balsall Common.	Respondent questions whether Dorridge has been considered for development.
61						Wishes to see wind turbines incorporated in developments.
62						Support enhancement of canals for leisure, tourism, healthy lifestyles and sustainable use. Use of canal towpaths to help meet Core Strategy objectives. Demand for marinas and role of residential moorings.
63	Broadly agree with issues. Need to consider policies to support a variety of businesses, not just the ones identified.	Supports Vision.	Supports objectives, but objective D should be broadened, objective S should be stronger.	Employment policies should be stronger and broader. Employment principle should support growth in North of Borough and give equal focus to South. Need to ensure that all types of businesses are supported (not just the regionally important ones).	Support elements of all 3 options but slight preference for option 2. However, Green Belt extension should be a last resort.	Combining elements of each Option, with a focus on Option 2 provides the greatest positive opportunities. Land at The Green, Shirley is promoted.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
64	Key issues omit RSS housing targets and review of Green Belt boundary.	No comment.	Additional wording proposed for Objective M to allow for Green Belt boundary review to meet RSS development requirements.	Right policy principles but need to ensure efficient use of land, especially close to public transport links.	Option 3 is favoured but should not be at the expense of some features of the other Options. Option 2 should give greater emphasis to rail corridors.	Need to refer to much higher levels of housing. Need to review Green Belt boundaries.
65	Key issues are appropriate. More reference needed to the Borough's advantageous location in the context of the motorway network. New key issue to ensure adequate roadside services.	Vision is appropriate, no changes required.	Right objectives but objective to 'retain an effective Green Belt' is inconsistent with Options 2 and 3. Need reference to reviewing Green Belt boundaries as current wording is inappropriate.	Policy principles are sound but change needed to acknowledge that Green Belt releases are a component part of deliverability in Solihull.	Preference for Option 3 with reservations about deliverability. Need to include the possibility of a new settlement within the Borough. Option 1 not realistic in terms of providing for higher housing numbers. Option 2 deliverability questioned also the impact of higher density development.	
66	Right key issues. Housing should be in planned locations - expand existing settlements (e.g., Dickens Heath) . K120 should include some slight additions to the wording.	Right Vision. Add RIS (as a key economic asset) to first bullet regarding economic success.	Right objectives. None missed. Objective F - housing should be provided 'in the right locations' Objective L - deliverability is also important.	Right policy principles. None missed. Housing should be in right locations and on deliverable sites.	Option 3 preferred. Major extension at Dickens Heath favoured.	It is not sufficient for sites to be sustainable, they also need to be deliverable.
67	Letter of no comment					Supports "managing waste".
68	Right key issues.	Welcomes Vision, building on economic success and supporting key assets.	Welcomes & supports objective D, priority should be given to development & commitment of public transport.	Broaden "meeting employment needs" to "supporting business and meeting employment needs" to align with objective D.	No preference as all Options will need to recognise the wider benefits of continued development at BIA.	Should be mindful of Airport Master Plan and noise exposure categories for residential development.
69	Generally right key issues. Support for rural facilities needs to be addressed.	Generally the right Vision. Enhancement of rural settlements needs to be added to the Vision.	Generally right objectives. Need to include an objective to support rural facilities, including rural housing issues.	Generally right policy principles. Need to include principles which refer to country towns and villages and rural housing and rural facilities.	A missed option would be the peripheral expansion of rural towns to support local facilities.	Document focuses on choices for the urban area whilst ignoring real rural problems. Should consider rural housing and rural facilities and services.
70	Right key issues, but they need expanding. Also urban oriented. Need an assessment of Green Belt boundaries and assessment of quality of Green Belt.	Right Vision, but should look beyond urban area. Role of rural area should be considered in more detail.	Right objectives, but urban oriented. Role of Green Belt and reassessment of Green Belt should be considered.	Need to widen scope. Green Belt principles have been missed and reassessing role of the Green Belt should be included.	All credible & viable. Expansion of Dickens Heath has been missed as an Option. Concern that Option 2 could lead to ribbon development.	Look at sustainable options outside urban areas. Assess quality and role of Green Belt.
71	Right key issues, but totally concentrated on urban areas. Needs of rural communities and businesses. Include issues related to rural areas.	Right Vision, but totally urban oriented. Need a strategy for rural areas and the Green Belt.	Right objectives, but no objectives for rural areas. Need an objective for rural areas, Green Belt and needs of M42 traffic.	Policy Principles not correct. Rural needs and facilities for M42 traffic need to be considered.	All credible & viable. Missed Option would be growth in sustainable locations outside urban boundary.	Document responds to current urban challenges, but needs to widen scope to include rural areas, villages and needs of users on M42 to stop and rest.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
72	Generally the right key issues. Rural housing and rural facilities need to be added and village expansion to support services.	Vision not comprehensive. Review of Green Belt needed.	Objectives not comprehensive. Need to include an objective to support rural communities and growth to support village facilities.	Generally the right policy principles. Need to refer to supporting rural communities and sustainable growth locations in rural areas.	No preference for any Option. A missed option would be peripheral growth for rural towns and villages to support facilities.	Further development at Dickens Heath to bolster local economy and support town centre facilities.
73	Generally the right key issues. Longer term employment issues have been missed. Need to include employment base and economy as a key issue.	The Vision has omissions. Need to include opportunities for economic growth.	Objectives have omissions. Need to include quality and purposes of Green Belt as well as continued expansion of employment.	Right policy principles. Need to cover employment needs, new allocations and growth areas.	Option 1 - consolidation preferred. Missed Option would be a sequential approach (PPS3). Favour urban extensions into the Green Belt.	Extend sequential approach to rural settlements. Provision of low cost/social housing on exception sites on settlement edges. Long term employment allocations.
74	Generally the right key issues but urban emphasis. Need to review Green Belt boundaries. Need to add rural issues.	Generally the right Vision, but urban focused. Needs to be a Vision for rural areas.	Generally the right Objectives. Rural housing, transport and facilities need to be added as well as housing in rural areas.	Generally the right policy principles. Need to review Green Belt policy principles and need a policy to allow rural housing.	All sound growth Options. Option 3 needs to include new clusters outside town boundary. Option 2 is too transport oriented.	Document does not consider rural issues which are different to urban issues. Rural housing needs study and new Green Belt assessment is required.
75	Not right key issues. Need to preserve Meriden Gap; meet needs of rural east of Borough; support retention & creation of employment; co-locate housing, employment and retail; reduce flooding; provide affordable housing.	Vision is not right. "Solihull in 2018" is an oxymoron; No measures of success or responsibility for 2026; Wrong to describe borough as location of choice. Regeneration is a rolling programme and won't finish in 2026; Community is already diverse - not much scope to do more.	Objectives are not right. Need to support rural environment; Protect Green Belt; Reduce flood risk. Include measurable targets; Transport infrastructure; Housing provision to reduce commuting.	Policy Principles not correct. Missed principles include decentralisation of services, transport infrastructure, green environment. Need to address Green Belt erosion in North Solihull.	Option 1 preferred. No options missed.	Options 2 & 3 depend on unrealistic transport infrastructure and employment.
76	Right key issues but need affordable housing in ALL rural areas.	Right Vision.	Right objectives but need affordable housing in ALL rural areas.	Right policy principles but need affordable housing in ALL rural areas.		Need an explicit reference to affordable housing and rural exception sites, including in Green Belt.
77						Does not support further expansion of Dickens Heath.
78	Not enough reference to the needs of an ageing population.				Should utilise brownfield land and release green field sites to enable a range of house types and densities to be built without losing the character of existing settlements. Balsall Common has potential for growth but this should not be limited to the east of the town. Option 1 has no merit and will continue to damage urban character and put pressure on existing infrastructure. Option 3 - location should not just be guided by rail infrastructure. Need to also look at settlements which have capacity in terms of local services.	
79	Little mention of waste management facilities and cross boundary movement.				WCC Transport Planning Group support Option 1 and Option 2. Option 3 growth in town centres and Marston Green, Olton and Dickens Heath is supported. Concern expressed regarding Balsall Common expansion due to lack of retail and leisure facilities and limited public transport offer. Enhancements to the rail station will be required including increased parking and pedestrian and cycle links.	

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
80	Some key issues require further elaboration. There is a lack of further development identified within areas other than North Solihull. Concern about Green Belt loss in the north of the Borough. Concern about parking issues around the railway station in Marston Green.	Vision broadly right, but key issue concerns should be incorporated.	No specific comments.	Definitely not correct. Most statements are contradictory, heavily weighted around railway, too many demands on Marston Green station, overdevelopment of Marston Green.	Elements of all 3 Options are acceptable, but none which address all concerns completely. Should consider affordable housing in South Solihull. Development should be spread across whole Borough. Too weighted around railway stations. No mention of Dorridge or Hampton-in-Arden sharing the load. Over reliance on the north of the Borough in all 3 Options.	Generally objects to development in Marston Green.
81	Right key issues identified but poor north to south public transport connectivity, specifically rail. Other issues include M42 congestion; healthcare for elderly. Key employers should be in 'headline' on page 10.	Right Vision. Need to add 'in the M42 growth area' after 'other major companies'.	Right objectives, but 'congestion' objective needs to target reduction of cost to business and individuals. Need to promote Solihull as an international destination using strengths of NEC and BIA. Appendix 2 on p37 needs to provide specific targets rather than a wish list.	Right policy principles. Specific measures and targets needed and performance management /reporting. No changes needed.	Option 3 preferred. No options missed. Option 1 is essentially 'no change'. Option 2 is a slight improvement but polarises transport into already congested corridors, Option 3 gives greatest level of ambition. Object to unnecessary loss of significant Green Belt but believe that it will be necessary to develop on parts of 'lower grade' Green Belt in order to maintain the economic competitiveness of the Region.	Support RSS housing recommendations but not NLP report. Would welcome greater emphasis on impact of key employers in Borough.
82	Fail to identify issues relating to tourism, culture and recreation/leisure.	Agree in principle with the Vision but length and detail may alienate individuals and groups of businesses from contributing. Vision needs to be more concise with an appropriate set of aims and objectives.	Objectives supported but they do not include sufficient emphasis on tourism and recreation.	No comments.	Option 3 preferable but there are reservations as it does not meet the needs of all residents. Options 1 and 2 fail to meet needs of rural communities. Missed Option would be development at Knowle and Dorridge.	Evidence base still required. Site allocations required before preferred option consultation. Concern about tourism and recreation.
83	Not enough emphasis on community safety. This should be an issue in its own right.	No specific comments.	Not enough emphasis on community safety. This needs to be an objective in its own right.	Need a policy on community safety and policing in new developments. Also need to include financial contributions to address additional policing costs.		
84					Option which includes Knowle and Dorridge has been missed.	Should recognise potential of Knowle/Dorridge to provide housing. Identifies land for possible development at Four Ashes Road.
85				Need a specific policy facilitating rural exceptions sites for affordable housing in the Green Belt.	Smaller extensions around the fringes of both urban and rural settlements should be considered before significant urban extensions. Support expansion of Balsall Common but disappointed that rural settlements have been missed as growth locations. Concern about major urban extensions proposed. Disagree with exclusion of Knowle and Dorridge.	

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
86	Broadly the right key issues. Promote regional economy in context of CSW corridor; Satisfy housing needs; selective review of GB boundaries Recognise development can result in improvements to environment and enhance character - Dickens Heath	Right Vision but 2nd bullet should not be North Solihull specific.	Right objectives. None missed. Maintaining GB should not preclude adjustments to boundaries.	Right policy principles. None missed.	Option 3 preferred but incorporating elements of 1 & 2. No options missed. Options 1 & 2 are impractical on their own.	Identifies land for possible development at Rumbush Lane.
87					Dislikes suggestion of Dickens Heath as a focus for development in Option 3.	Focussing development on Dickens Heath would be contrary to principle of maintaining an effective Green Belt.
88					Focussing development where there is good transport infrastructure does not justify high density development in congested areas of Shirley and Solihull	Further growth should not be in the centres of Shirley and Solihull.
89	Right key issues. No recognition of how Green Belt will restrict delivery of objectives. Recognise need to review Green Belt and safeguard future of BBP and adjoining assets - NEC BIA and International Station.	Vision not right. - should emphasise employment and economic growth. Should be more specific in linkages between economic policies for North Solihull and Green Belt review; More policies to expedite regeneration.	Right objectives. None missed. Recognise review of Green Belt required.	Needs emphasis on economic growth, Green Belt review and regeneration. More is needed on North Solihull regeneration links to Green Belt review.	Parts of 1 & 2 are preferred. No options missed. Supports development in buffer zone of BBP. General focus on housing but need to address employment (jobs and land). Opposes urban extension north and west of Chester Road (Option 3).	Repondent refers to Birmingham Business Park.
90	Two new key issues needed - maintain flexible responsive supply of land for housing and achieving high quality housing. Meeting development requirements whilst addressing planning constraints should acknowledge the importance of meeting RSS housing requirements that are likely to result in the release of Green Belt land.	Vision supported.	Supports objectives.		A further option is needed to accommodate higher growth levels than those in the presented options. This should focus early development in the urban area; outside the Green Belt at larger settlements, in public transport corridors and phased urban extensions. None of the options provide enough housing (but elements of each could provide the basis of a further option).	Identifies 'white Land' for possible development at Knowle.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
91	Two new key issues needed: - maintain flexible responsive supply of land for housing and achieving high quality housing. Meeting development requirements whilst addressing planning constraints should acknowledge the importance of meeting RSS housing requirements that are likely to result in the release of Green Belt land.		Right objectives.	Need for flexibility to deliver development required by RSS.	A further option is needed to accommodate higher growth levels than those in the presented options. This should focus early development in the urban area; outside the Green Belt at larger settlements, in public transport corridors and phased urban extensions. None of the options provide enough housing (but elements of each could provide the basis of a further option).	Identifies land for possible development at Aqueduct Road.
92		Doesn't recognise need to provide for growth in a sustainable way. No reference of need for Solihull to grow/provide homes in a range and type of tenure.			Supports Option 1 because it directs development to main urban areas and the development of 3 long-term housing sites in the urban areas.	Identifies a long term housing site for possible development. Considers Knowle and Dorridge should not be omitted from options. Does not favour new settlements.
93					Support option 1.	Seeks to prioritise the redevelopment of previously developed sites in highly accessible locations in major urban areas.
94				Policy principles should prioritise the use of safeguarded land (in the UDP) before using Green Belt land for development.	Strategy needed based on higher densities near main centres, urban extensions north and east, expansion of Balsall Common and development of safeguarded land (UDP). Presented options do not provide for enough housing development. Should not dismiss 'excluded' villages as growth locations.	Identifies safeguarded land at Cheswick Green/Tidbury Green for possible development.
95					Proposes an option combining all 3 presented options together with long term housing sites (in UDP), other favoured sites and land near Chelmsley Wood, East of Damson Parkway, Sheldon, and East of Solihull Town Centre. Presented options do not provide for enough housing development.	Identifies land for possible development at Bickenhill Road and elsewhere.
96					Proposes an option combining all 3 presented options together with long term housing sites (in UDP), other favoured sites and land near Chelmsley Wood, East of Damson Parkway, Sheldon, and East of Solihull Town Centre. Presented options do not provide for enough housing development.	Identifies land for possible development east of Solihull Town Centre and elsewhere.
97					Proposes an option combining all 3 presented options together with long term housing sites (in UDP), other favoured sites and land near Chelmsley Wood, East of Damson Parkway, Sheldon, and East of Solihull Town Centre. Presented options do not provide for enough housing development.	Identifies land for possible development at Damson Parkway and elsewhere.
98					Proposes an option combining all 3 presented options together with long term housing sites (in UDP), other favoured sites and land near Chelmsley Wood, East of Damson Parkway, Sheldon, and East of Solihull Town Centre. Presented options do not provide for enough housing development.	Identifies land for possible development east of Balsall Common and elsewhere.
99					Proposes an option combining all 3 presented options together with long term housing sites (in UDP), other favoured sites and land near Chelmsley Wood, East of Damson Parkway, Sheldon, and East of Solihull Town Centre. Presented options do not provide for enough housing development.	Identifies land for possible development west of Balsall Common and elsewhere.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
100		Vision generally supported.	Right objectives.	Right policy principles. Over-arching policy principle needed to commit to achieving sustainable patterns of development leading to improvements in social, economic and environmental characteristics of Solihull. Principles should encourage use of previously developed land/premises.	Combination of options 1 and 2 preferred.	Identifies land for possible development near Solihull Town Centre.
101						Core Strategy should identify network of centres, place them in a retail hierarchy. Should enhance accessibility of, quality and variety of all centres within the hierarchy. Should plan how best to distribute growth to achieve stated objectives.
102	Add health of residents - young and old.	Right Vision.	Right objectives. Improve health, fitness and quality of life for all.	Right policy principles. Promote healthier lifestyles. Target traffic reduction measures and promote cycling.	Options 1 & 2 preferred. Cluster development at Balsall Common too remote and will encourage car use.	Seeks to promote cycling and the ability of cycling to make an important contribution to improved environment.
103		In general agreement ('difficult to disagree').			Option 1 (subject to analysis of impact of options) preferred.	Seeks to promote sustainable development principles and address inequalities in the Borough.
104		The contribution of cycling to accessibility without reliance on the car should be strongly reflected in the Vision and principles.		The contribution of cycling to accessibility without reliance on the car should be strongly reflected in the Vision and principles.	Favours development in existing centres. Opposes option 3 if clusters are in rural areas.	Seeks to promote cycling as a mode of transport and for its contribution to promoting sustainable development principles.
105	Right key issues.					Seeks to protect the Green Belt in the Marston Green area and to alleviate traffic problems in the vicinity of Marston Green Station.
106	Letter of no comment.					Reminds the Council of Daw Mill mining operations that will extend beneath part of Solihull.
107			Include objective relating to affordable housing.			Document highlights north/south issues and takes into consideration other strategies and demonstrates some flexibility. Level of flexibility may need review as RSS process moves forward. Should reflect more prominently national indicator NI188. AWM corridor study not mentioned.
108						Seeks to enable warehouse clubs on business sites and asks that the Core Strategy includes a broad enough definition of business development to include them.
109	Should reflect the need to broaden the appeal of town centres to a broad range of ages and social groups.		Strengthen 'Ensure a range of places to go and things to do' by being more specific on enhancing existing facilities and providing for new ones where appropriate.		Option 3 preferred.	Seeks to promote participation in cultural activity, meet future community needs for cultural facilities and protect existing facilities. Core Strategy should reflect and facilitate these aims.
110					No preference for the options. Presented options are limited and don't include all realistic options. Options do not provide enough housing development. Knowle/Dorridge should not have been omitted from the options.	Identifies land for possible development east of Knowle.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
111					Options do not provide enough housing development . Knowle/Dorridge should not have been omitted from the options.	Identifies land for possible development near Knowle.
112				Greater provision for first class sport facilities required. Need to safeguard and increase provision of land for modern industrial manufacturing. Need to move away from speculative office schemes.	Concern about provision of areas of open space.	Seeks greater provision for sport and recreation across the Borough and to safeguard and increase land for modern industry. Concerned that open space will be lost to housing and no new open space will be created.
113	Should reflect need to retain/increase activity in major urban areas and that Green Belt should reflect overall quantity and quality as well as simply maintaining Green Belt. Should also aim for modal shift away from car to public transport.	Vision should commit to national aims on global ecological /environmental issues such as global warming.	Add objective that encourages development in locations well served by public transport and/or locations where good public transport can be provided/sustained. Discourage development in locations hard to access by public transport and where it would be difficult to provide or sustain. Improve accessibility - add 'education' as named trip end and 'by non car modes of travel' Reduce congestion - clarify that it refers to highway congestion. Retain an effective Green Belt - change to effective quality and quantity of Green Belt land. Objectives should reflect spatial distribution as a determinant of accessibility. Rearranging public transport and services to serve poor choices of location for development is unlikely to be successful.	Principles should say how the Council will work with neighbouring districts. Key principle should be to improve mobility/accessibility for non car users and to prioritise commercial and public service movement over private transport where highway capacity is scarce. Aiming for no gap of inequality for North Solihull and for its equality of access is unrealistic.	Option 1 (followed by option 2) is preferred. Suggest a a mix of options 1 and 2 that identifies growth nodes for intensive development at the junction of key corridors. Favours focussing development in locations well served by public transport. Opposes option 3 because clusters are too dispersed and not so easily served by public transport.	Keen to make further contact with the Council and others to promote sustainable development patterns.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
114	Should separately identify & emphasise provision/safeguarding of minerals and commitment to meet regional apportionment for aggregates. Development & beneficial use of brownfield sites should be key issue. Amend key issues to raise importance of contribution of minerals to employment/wealth generation.		Need for separate objective for development/safeguarding of finite mineral reserves.	Minerals not appropriate in 'Managing Waste' section. Approach to minerals supported but should be expanded. Should include biodiversity potential and potential of restored mineral sites for Green Belt development. Mineral development is compatible with Green Belt development. Should be greater emphasis on using restored mineral workings rather than new Green Belt land.		
115					Option 2 favoured because it focuses development in main urban areas, along key public transport routes and includes an accessible urban extension.	Urban extensions should be accepted where they are close to public transport and facilities.
116	The key issues should acknowledge demographic trends and the need for more elderly care developments that should be planned for and allocated through the LDF.	Vision is right.	The objectives should reflect the need for developments that serve the needs of the elderly. Maintaining an effective Green Belt should not preclude the development of sites that do not perform an effective Green Belt function	Should acknowledge the need to develop Green Belt sites to accommodate growth in appropriate locations.	Option 3 favoured. It focuses development in main urban areas, around railway stations and in larger settlements, including Balsall Common.	Identifies land for possible development near Balsall Common.
117	Right key issues. Should also identify funding and delivery of transport interventions needed to support future growth and development.	Vision is right.		Include a transport and access policy principle which embraces managing travel behaviour and transport demand, encourages efficient use of transport infrastructure, enables infrastructure and interventions needed to support communities and promotes economic growth without growth in travel.		Reserves position on merits of options but keen to work with the Council on transport issues.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
118	Should include: 'the need to regenerate and rejuvenate town centres, taking account of market conditions'.	Amend Bullet 3 of the Vision to: 'Meeting the needs of its increasingly diverse residents and businesses, for housing, retail, local services , leisure and culture, education, skills and opportunities, in a sustainable and fair way.' Amend bullet 4 to; 'Accessible and able to support a well connected, well managed and integrated transport system that provides a realistic, safe, accessible and attractive alternative to the private car, particularly in terms of public transport connections where this is practicable, reasonable and viable'.	General agreement. Objective A (appendix 2) demand should be included as factor influencing location of development. Objective E Low carbon development needs to be practical/viable. Objective F affordable housing should be based on need i.e. number, size, type and location. Objective I should not presume to retain employment sites that are long -term vacant. Objective L should refer to need to consider other key principles outlined. Objective N should refer to mixed use development (suggest wording for these amendments).	Should acknowledge that any targets for renewable energy must be reasonable/viable and flexible. Should not be blanket retention of employment sites. Consideration should be given to size and location of residential units to reflect housing needs. Should support mixed use development in town centres.	Option 3 preferred because focuses development in or around town centres. Options should clarify that leisure use is an acceptable town centre use.	
119						Identification of sustainable locations on the West Coast Mainline takes no account of services. Marston Green is unsuitable for high-density development and already has a good supply of starter homes. A large part of its green heritage has been lost through development of Chelmsley Wood. Green Belt release southeast of Marston Green would damage the Meriden gap. Dorridge has a good train service, shopping facilities and little affordable housing. Bickenhill village has infill capacity and is in need of community enhancement and is within easy walking distance of rail and bus services. Hampton-in-Arden has infill capacity, main line facilities but limited bus services.
120						Generally welcomes the document and offers advice on development of the Core Strategy to support the economy, meet needs sustainably and support regeneration.
121	Group key issues on topic basis to make document more meaningful & help determine any policy gaps.	Right Vision.	Objectives should be categorised & linked to key issues.	Carbon target should be in line with national standards or else be reasonable/realistic. Green Belt should be used after exhausting sequential testing.	Support all 3 growth Options.	Building for Life' criteria should be prerequisite for all new developments. Caution on promoting high density development. Provision of affordable housing paramount in considering revised RSS & use of Green Belt land for residential development.
122						Suggest a variety of additions to the document. Main points - need to place the strategy in the context of projections of future economic growth potential and demand for employment land/premises. Need to ensure Solihull's attractiveness as an investment location is strengthened . Focus of north Solihull should be strengthened in terms of developing economic infrastructure and linking to key employment locations outside the area.

Resp. No.	KEY ISSUES	VISION	OBJECTIVES	POLICY PRINCIPLES	GROWTH OPTIONS	OTHER COMMENTS
123					Option 1 preferred. Option 3 could have an adverse impact on Meriden shops and services.	Disagrees that Meriden would need significant growth to ensure that it could develop in a sustainable way (P29).
124	Should be grouped in themes. Additional key issue needed is impact of new development on care and health provision.	Public transport connections should relate to all areas of Borough (4th bullet of Vision).		Need to ensure that remote villages have basic facilities/services to be sustainable. Also need to reduce inequality.	Option 1 preferred and oppose Option 3.	Document doesn't reflect 'truly rural' character of Meriden/Millisons Wood. Any new housing in Meriden Parish must maintain village/rural character of Parish and social infrastructure and services must be improved. Connections with other strategies and plans needs to be made clear. An equality impact assessment should be available for each option.
125					Option 1 or Option 3 preferred. If urban extensions are advocated in the emerging strategy these should be at locations with good public transport, preferably rail.	
126	Need to address issue of sustainable design and incorporate green infrastructure. Also, protect character and function of landscape. Need to address flood risk, pressures on natural resources and threats to biodiversity.	Should include reference to reducing carbon footprint in accommodating development. Also protecting and enhancing biodiversity, natural beauty, water and historic environment, landscape and cultural heritage.	Suggest a number of specific objectives relating to improvements to infrastructure and services, minimising negative environmental impacts of development and contributing positively to environmental issues, efficient use of resources and protecting natural and historic features.	Include a principle that housing growth should be accommodated with minimal impact on the natural environment and deliver maximum benefits. Changes suggested include commitment to protecting/enhancing the environment, reducing carbon emissions and improving biodiversity.	Options do not adequately state how they will address the need for accessible green space, protection of the natural environment and provision of green infrastructure.	Raises a variety of questions and considerations that will need to be addressed further during the LDF process.
127					Option 3 preferred. Option 1: preferable for most local residents - protects Green Belt but insufficient additional dwellings for economic growth/affordable housing. Option 2: a failed compromise. Option 3: negative elements of concern, but provides best opportunity of benefiting residential and business communities.	
128	Key issues are the right ones but need to add tourism and provision of sufficient visitor accommodation for business people and people using BIA/NEC.	No strong views.	Right objectives but need something on ensuring a good supply of visitor accommodation (NEC and Airport).	Right policy principles but need to include something on visitor accommodation.	Option 2 preferred.	