

*KSA is a non-political group
of residents who care about
Shirley, and its future as a
good place to live*

Keep Shirley Alive

Committee:

Fiona Anderson 0121 745 5684
Alan and Irene Bonner 0121 603 6909
Robert and Valli Cawte 0121 745 3882
Shirley Moss 0121 744 5608
David Pack 0121 745 2626
John and Hilary Powell 0121 608 8833
Geoff Stevens 0121 682 0703
Richard Wise 0121 745 2679

Please reply to: Robert Cawte
57 Jacey Rd, Shirley
Solihull B90 3LN

12th April 2008

Mike Swallow
Solihull MBC, PO Box 9
Council House, Solihull B91 9QR

CC: Mrs Mary Travers
Planning Inspectorate
Room 3/06, Temple Quay House
2 The Square, Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
Ref: GOWM/NPT/CPO/87694

Dear Mr Swallow,

The Metropolitan Borough of Solihull (Shirley Town Centre Redevelopment) Compulsory Purchase Order 2007 and related orders under S247 and S257 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Thank you for your letter dated 5th March 2008 requesting us to reconsider our objections to the above. Incidentally, your letter did not arrive until 18th March.

We respond as follows:

Compulsory Purchase Order

We do not wish to pursue a formal objection further. We have read the Inquiry Guidance Notes sent to us and note that objectors should if possible avoid raising issues which have been dealt with at the planning stage.

However, although we feel sure that the Inspector is aware of the background to this development we wish to make the following observations:

Keep Shirley Alive and other groups like *Shirley Residents Association* have opposed the proposed "Parkgate" development on behalf of Shirley residents. Residents and also shopkeepers have shown their opposition in our local Referendum, at packed local public meetings, and in surveys conducted by KSA.

1. We remain convinced that the proposed superstore based development is too big for Shirley and threatens some of the surviving small independent shops. This view was supported by the independent *Localise West Midlands* Report published in 2005. Shirley is already the "Supermarket Capital" of the Midlands with 7 supermarkets and superstores within a 3 mile strip of the Stratford Rd, and another just over the border in Hall Green - quality and quantity in abundance.
2. The increase in traffic and pollution is unacceptable to residents.
3. The loss of nearly 3 acres of parkland and open space is unacceptable to residents, who do not believe that alternative schemes were considered, but think that it was a done deal with Asda.

Public Footpath Stopping Up Order

We are still concerned about points we raised in our original letter of objection. Unless they are resolved in the meantime, we wish to reiterate them at the Inquiry. **Shirley Residents Association have also asked us to speak on their behalf.**

1. Safety at the Service Road Junction

The proposed new footpath entrance on Haslucks Green Rd is next to Asda's proposed service road. Rather than being 'enhanced', we think this entrance may pose a potential hazard for pedestrians who will have to cross the path of large articulated vehicles. In particular the plan supplied to us shows a radiused kerb on the right, but no radiused kerb for vehicles turning left out of the service road. Plan 3089 / PA140 also shows a pedestrian crossing set back from Haslucks Green road and some "removable" bollards.

Planning Officer Gary Palmer informed us during a telephone conversation in March that he did not think there was any traffic restriction on trucks approaching or leaving from any direction, yet the design of the junction indicates that drivers are intended to approach only from the Stratford Rd direction i.e.: the east, and to leave that way.

a) Truck drivers do not always follow instructions, e.g.: there may be a traffic jam on the Stratford Road (as there frequently is) and there is no indication on the plan of anything that would physically prevent them from turning left to exit the service road to the west. If that were to happen there would be a risk of heavy goods vehicles mounting the pavement at the corner.

b) We think that many pedestrians will not walk the extra distance to the paved crossing shown on the plan, but will take the shortest route to cross the service road, i.e.: at the corner. If there is a truck coming they will wait on the corner. A pedestrian leaving the new footpath and wishing to cross to the other side of Haslucks Green Road will obviously stand on the corner.

c) Because of the ongoing risk, we are concerned that a removable bollard would not be substantial enough protection, or to prevent trucks turning left.

2. Park entrance alongside a busy service road

Although you say the service road will be screened, trucks climbing the 1 in 20 ramp to exit will be noisy and with unpleasant exhaust fumes detracting from the purpose and nature of the recreational space that the present footpath serves.

3. Opposition to the development We withdraw this point, which you say is not relevant to the Secretary of State's decision.

4 and 5. Hedgerows and seclusion. We genuinely feel strongly that the present park footpath is away from noise and traffic and is environmentally friendly. It is like "a woodland glade" in summer, as the enclosed photographs show. The footpath is bounded by old important hedgerows which are home to a variety of wildlife and which act as a woodland screen. This gives a sense of seclusion which is enjoyed by residents. However, the new path will be bounded by the proposed commercial development and flats on one side and the "temporary" car park on the other. This will remove the sense of seclusion that the present parkland access provides for city dwellers. We do not agree with the response that the new footpath will be a real improvement.

6. Increased walking distance. We accept that the increased walking distance is only 35 metres, although this may still be a concern to some older residents wishing to walk from Haslucks Green Road to the High Street shops to the South of the Saracens Head.

Road Closure Order

We do not wish to pursue our objection to this order, other than to ask for written assurances on the following:

1. That unrestricted access will be allowed across the proposed new development to the park and to the British Legion, particularly as there is a well established existing public access which you refer to as a "short cut" in your letter.
2. That access to alternative recycling facilities will be provided.

Yours Sincerely,

Robert Cawte
On behalf of *Keep Shirley Alive*



