

Hampton-in-Arden Parish Neighbourhood Plan

Consultation Responses

Category	Identifier	Ref in Draft Plan	Point Made	Nature of Comment	PC Response	Change made to Draft Plan
Hampton Resident	Resident H1	Policy B1	Fully Support	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H1	3.19 H2	Elderly houses do not necessarily have to be small.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H1	3C	No mention of poor access to railway station on northbound platform.	Comment	Agreed but not appropriate to this plan.	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H2	General	Fully Support	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H3	General	Plan is pointless as no one listens	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H4	Policy T3	Plea for full zebra crossings in High Street	Request for change	Noted but PC has a settled policy which has been widely consulted on.	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H5	General	Very strong and reflects the needs of the area	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H5	Policy B1	Make it 'Brownfield first'	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Hampton Resident	Resident H5	3D	Include footpaths, trees and biodiversity in protected views	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Hampton Resident	Resident H5	Policy B1	Work more closely with Openreach to roll out FTP connections	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Hampton Resident	Resident H5	General	Important to prevent development across gaps	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H6	Environmental Policies	Needs to address policy on battery storage and solar farms. Better Green Belt map	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Hampton Resident	Resident H7	Environmental Policies	Suggest we address the siting of heat pumps etc within properties	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Hampton Resident	Resident H8	General	Fully support all the policies	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H9	Throughout	Several detailed suggestions to alter the text to effectively make back garden development impossible.	Request for change	These changes would move PC policy beyond current position and that of SMBC. Noted.	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H9	Environmental Policies	Needs to address policy on wind farms.	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Hampton Resident	Resident H10	General	Fantastic piece of work, very comprehensive.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H10	Housing	There should be strict controls to prevent conversion of garages to living space.	Request for change	Not considered practical	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H10	SSIs	Does the SSI on Shadowbrook Lane still exist?	Question	Not directly relevant to this consideration;.	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H11	General	Generally it's very good and I agree with it.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H11	Farm Diversification	Chestnut Farm seems to be able to diversify with impunity, so does the plan carry any weight?	Comment	This facility is not within the Parish. Point noted.	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H11	Parking Problems	We need more public parking created even if that means building over areas of green belt.	Comment	Noted, but this is not the prevailing view from the consultation.	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H11	Housing	We need to face the fact that we need to allow more building over areas of green belt.	Comment	Noted, but this is not the prevailing view from the consultation.	No changes made

Hampton Resident	Resident H11	EV Charging	We need more EV points even if that means building over areas of green belt.	Comment	Noted, but this is not the prevailing view from the consultation.	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H11	Traffic Calming	We don't need any more road humps as they are counterproductive. Cameras would be better.	Comment	Agreed, and are moving in this direction.	No changes made
Hampton Resident	Resident H12	Para 3.10 Housing	The proposed allocation SO1 including 2022 update, is for 770 dwellings	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Hampton Resident	Resident H12	General	There is no commentary in the plan on the expected percentage increase in the population of the village once Ashtree Grove and the AWS developments are completed and how it is proposed that the increased pressure on utilities, amenities and services will be addressed.	Comment	Understood but not practical in this plan.	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C1	General	No further comments	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C2	Page 41 Map	Map is inaccurate	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C2	Page 15 Para 2.6	Typo/sentence doesn't make sense.	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C2	General	Well written, no objections	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C3	General	Well written, strongly support	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C4	General	Comprehensive and well thought out	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C4	General	Maybe more emphasis on infrastructure services to support development	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C5	General	Needs more on traffic calming	Comment	Noted, but not appropriate to this Plan	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C6	General	No problem with this plan	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C7	General	Needs to address policy on battery storage	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C8	Footpaths	Needs to address the lack of footpaths on Lugtrout Lane	Request for change	Traffic policy issue rather than planning.	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C8	Views	Should also seek to preserve views around canal at Henwood	Request for change	Noted but insufficient evidence from original survey to make this case	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C9	General	I support the plan	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C10	General	Needs to address policy on battery storage	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C10	Traffic Calming	Should address the one way proposal for Field Lane	Request for change	Traffic policy issue rather than planning.	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C11	General	Reflective, fair and representative of the whole community.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C12	Throughout	Stylistic and presentational suggestions to improve all maps.	Request for change	Much of this is a matter of style and personal preference. Some suggestions impractical. Noted but most will not be adopted.	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C12	Throughout	Comments on use of acronyms	Request for change	Point noted - will add a glossary.	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C12	Throughout	Needs more emphasis on improvements in community services to support development	Request for change	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C13	General	Very content with the plan	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C14	General	Very comprehensive and informative	Comment	Noted	No changes made

Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C15	Figs 5 and 8	Site SO1 Plan looks wrong - check	Factual Correction	Map aligns with that in Solihull Local Plan	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C15	General	Needs to address policy on battery storage	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C15	Fig 15	Housing numbers error	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C15	Policy 2	Update Design Code	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C15	General	Needs advice on where SMBC policies can be found	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C16	General	We agree to the draft plan	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C17	General	I am in favour of the Plan	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C18	General	Happy to recommend the plan goes forward	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C19	Page 15 Para 2.6	Typo/sentence doesn't make sense.	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C19	Page 39	Make Diddington Lane one way.	Request for change	Noted but PC has a settled policy which has been widely consulted on.	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C19	Para 3.32	Add Catney Common as a protected view	Request for change	Noted but insufficient evidence from original survey to make this case	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C20	General	Current draft is acceptable to me.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C21	General	I agree with the overall content but we seem to keep losing the battles to limy development	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C22	General	Happy with the proposed plan.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C22	General	Needs to address policy on battery storage	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C23	General	The Lugtrout Lane development will increase settlement size two-fold. This should be emphasised.	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C23	Page 41 Map	Map of common is inaccurate	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Catherine de Barnes Resident	Resident C23	General	Ancient woodlands should be mentioned	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Hampton Business	Business H1	General	Essentially a statement about the challenges of operating a retail outlet in the village centre due to access and parking problems.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Hampton Business	Business H1	Shops	Resistance to change of use is too restrictive	Request for change	Point taken, will modify text	AMENDED
Hampton Business	Business H1	Housing	Need a stronger policy of ensuring that housing plots have adequate off road parking	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	2.4 First bullet point – Protection of the Green Belt	The last sentence is not relevant to green belt policy – (<i>Guidance provided in SMBC's document Solihull's Countryside Strategy 2010 to 2020 and the Warwickshire Landscape (Arden) Guidelines is also relevant</i>). Would this be better moved to the next bullet point?	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	2.4 Second bullet point – Preservation of cherished views	Could the PC clarify further in this section what is meant by this it would be helpful to be clearer what the Neighbourhood Plan is expecting when it is protecting these?	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed.	AMENDED

Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 2.9 - Following - Listed Building consent is required for works to a listed property.	It would be useful to add that Planning permission is also required for fences, walls, other means of enclosure and detached buildings within the curtilage of listed buildings as they do not have normal permitted. Suggest quoting this, or adding a version of these words that Historic England say: development rights for these.	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 2.10	Change to heritage assets and their settings is, of course, acceptable where it is sustainable in terms of the NPPF; change is only unacceptable where it harms significance without an appropriate balance of public benefit. Advice in https://historicengland.org.uk/images-books/publications/making-changes-heritage-assets-advice-note-2/heag023-making-changes-to-heritage-assets/	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 2.13	The last line of the paragraph - Any new work needs to reflect the scale, density, outlook and style of these properties. Suggest adding '..so that acceptable change that suits its context is achieved -	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 2.16	As stated above the NPPF is currently under review, it is therefore likely that references to NPPF 149 & 150 will soon be out of date. The Parish Council could consider deleting this paragraph as it simply repeats policy in the NPPF	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 2.18	Consider use of wording relating to site SO1 in terms of it being an 'incursion' into green belt as it will not be in the green belt if taken forward	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 2.19	May be better to amend to 'exceptions are set out in the NPPF'. (delete reference to SLP P17 that simply elaborates on the NPPF)	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Page 23: 2.26	It is suggested that the first line of the sentence which states 'must in any case' is replaced with 'must where necessary' (to make it more enforceable)	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 2.26	Consider whether this is NPPF compliant to state that development should contribute to flood alleviation and the effective management of wastewater	Improvement Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Flood Risk Map	It would be useful if the Parish Council could reference the source of this map.	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	B1	We would suggest care in relation to wording that supports the expansion of businesses into the green belt. Part 4 of emerging Local Plan Policy P17 only identifies the reasonable expansion of established businesses in the Green Belt as one factor which may be taken into account as very special circumstances in considering proposals for 'inappropriate development'.	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED

Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	B2	It would be useful to clarify whether this is meant to be shops and services or whether it includes all businesses. Also is the intention to protect all uses or just valued ones. Further detail on what criteria would be used to determine whether there is acceptable alternative provision nearby or that there is no reasonable prospect of the continued use of the building for a similar use would be helpful. Would also consider the use of the word 'community' at the end of the paragraph.	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Policies B3 and B4	It would be useful if further detail could be given in terms of what the NP will support in terms of improving facilities for home working and digital communication.	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	3B Housing Provision	SMBC welcomes acknowledgement of the emerging Local Plan Housing allocations in the NP and acceptance in principle of allocations HA1 and HA2	Comment	Noted	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Pg30 and P31	Maps showing allocations may need updating if any boundary changes occur through the progression of the Local Plan examination / Local Plan Review process. The Council can provide the Parish Council with shape files of the site allocations if that would be helpful.	Comment	Noted	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 3.10	The proposed allocation SO1 including 2022 update, is for 770 dwellings	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Pg34	First paragraph - would suggest simplifying the wording to state <i>'We will not support housing development in the Green belt unless it is compliant with the relevant provisions of the NPPF'</i>	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Policy H3	Lifetime Homes standard mostly corresponds to Building Regulation standard M4(2), which is being proposed as part of Policy P4(E).The Government is proposing to "To mandate the current M4(2) requirement in Building Regulations as a minimum standard for all new homes, with M4(1) applying by exception only, where M4(2) is impractical and unachievable (e.g. a new build flat above a garage). M4(3) would apply where there is a local planning policy in place in which a need has been identified and evidenced." Further consultation is necessary, however, on how this will be achieved. Raising accessibility standards for new homes: summary of consultation responses and government response - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) (29th July 2022	Clarity Suggestion	Noted. Take out reference to Lifetime Homes.	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	H4	The EV charging requirement set out in the Neighbourhood Plan for non-residential development is 1 charging space for every 5 car parking spaces. This goes beyond Part S of the building regulations (July 2022) and emerging Local Plan policy P9 which require 1 EV charging space per 10 parking spaces. The Parish Council would need set out evidence to justify this approach at examination.	Concern - re SMBC Policy	Agreed.	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	H7	The reference should be updated to reflect that the Residential Back land Development SPD was adopted on 28 th July 2021.	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED

Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Figure 18	It would be useful if the PC could set out what the indicative line for the pedestrian / cycle way is based on.	Clarity Suggestion	This section dropped from Plan.	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Page 38 - Action Plans - Safe Cycling and Pedestrian Routes	Comment – the route indicated suggests that at some points the provision of a new surface for the purpose might have some impact upon the setting of designated heritage assets. Consideration of proposals will also need to take account of benefits for heritage such as new views of a listed building and its setting for a user travelling at low speed and greater height than seated in a car. Village vitality might also benefit from increased leisure time spent in the settlements due to increased safe accessibility by bicycle or on foot	Comment	Some good points here, will review	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Action Plan	Rather than seeking the closure of Diddington Lane it might more be appropriate for the Plan to say the Parish Council will seek to minimise the impacts of traffic where necessary rather than mention a specific road or provide justification for why this road is considered a particular issue	Comment	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 3.22	Comment - The aims are appreciated, and the two recent traffic calming humps are reasonably unobtrusive, any measures should be designed to have as little impact as possible upon the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of other heritage assets. Signage, markings and other measures should follow Historic England Street for All guidance wherever possible. For example, granite sett rumble strips might be visually more suitable than raised humps with white triangle markings in some locations.	Comment	This seems to be a general comment rather than a request for a modification. I could try and use some of their words, but I'm not sure this point requires any action.	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Policy T1 and policy introduction	Comment - As previous comment, including for any new footpaths and/ or cycle ways to be designed with full regard for minimising impacts upon the conservation area and upon any other heritage assets setting	Comment	OK. Bit similar to comment above. I can modify the words slightly to use some of their words.	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Action Plan	We would suggest use of the wording 'demand based public transport' rather than or in addition to Ring and Ride as this is a brand name and would allow for a range of options to be considered.	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	3D - Section introduction (last line)	In last line of para could delete 'in some exceptional circumstances' (amenity is a prime purpose of TPOs). We welcome support for the principles in draft local plan policy P12 Waste Management	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Policy E3	Text should read SSSI throughout	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Policy E4	Typo – We will be supportive of developments which are are highly sustainable. The PC may wish to consider whether there are any ways the NP could promote sustainable sources of energy and construction in design.	Typo correction and comment	Happy to change the typo. Second point is challenging but not an unreasonable suggestion.	AMENDED

Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Policy E4	Reference to lifetime homes could may be better placed in the housing section rather than sustainability policy	Clarity Suggestion	Noted. Take out reference to Lifetime Homes.	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	3E Quality of Place	Within this section in general the Parish Council may wish to consider whether the Plan could say more about landscape features within the parish, including blue infrastructure. Could the Neighbourhood Plan take a more landscape lead approach? The Parish Council may wish to consider whether there is any scope to review the local list of listed buildings or undertake a Conservation Area Appraisal Review as an action	Clarity Suggestion	Noted, but not appropriate to take further.	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Section introduction	Reference to 'further inappropriate development' suggests that there has been inappropriate development. Again could this paragraph be simplified to 'We will not support development in the green belt unless it is compliant with the relevant provisions of the NPPF'.	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	(Page 50) 3.49	Comment – rather than amenity and appearance it might be preferable to say <i>'particular attention be given to the preservation or enhancement of the significance of all heritage assets in proportion to their significance and their contribution to local character and distinctiveness'</i> .	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Section 3E Quality of Place	In line with the NPPF and Historic England guidance, this could emphasise the overall need to establish and conserve significance rather than list some buildings and groups (and inevitably leave some out of that list). This might allow an evident wider capture of the contribution of numerous heritage assets to the character of the settlements, even where the building may not be listed, which might support a stronger response to some unsuitable proposals for change. Significance emphasises the need to conserve more than appearance and amenity too, capturing for example internal building fabric of historic value not evident externally.	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Section 3E Quality of Place	Comments – suggest addition in red above to reflect NPPF words; plus, is it worth adding words below: We note and support the NPPF requirement that harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset through alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting, should require clear and convincing justification, and should be exceptional or wholly exceptional as set out in paragraph 200.	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC		SMBC welcomes acknowledgement of the emerging Local Plan Housing allocations in the NP and acceptance in principle of allocations HA1 and HA2	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Policy Q2	The Building for life 12 standard has been updated and should refer to Building for a Healthy Life	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	3F Community Services	3F Community Services This section makes no mention of Assets of Community Value The Parish Council may be missing an opportunity to provide protection for community facilities	Comment	Noted	No changes made

Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 1 SMBC	Para 4.2	The Submission Draft will be submitted to SMBC who are then responsible for undertaking a six-week consultation on this final draft (Regulation 16 consultation). The Council is responsible for taking receipt of the consultation responses and arranging for independent examination of the Submission Neighbourhood Plan.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 2 Historic England	General	No adverse comments	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 3 Balsall Common Parish Council	General	No comments	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultees 4 Meriden Parish Council	Housing	Might be worth seeing if SMBC have any further statistics to support housing needs stats.	Comment	Already explored. Nothing available.	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultees 4 Meriden Parish Council	Housing	New build houses need at least two off road parking spaces	Comment	Covered in current wording	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultees 4 Meriden Parish Council	General	Worth adding an objective of working with neighbouring parish councils especially to strengthen provision of infrastructure services	Comment	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 5 Natural England	General	No adverse comments	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 6 West Midlands Police	General	Timing of this plan may be premature as the Solihull Local Plan is not yet approved	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 6 West Midlands Police	P11 Vision	Add 'safe'	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 6 West Midlands Police	Page 34	Update Design Code (Extensive detail provided on this)	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 6 West Midlands Police	Page 38 - Action Plans - Safe Cycling and Pedestrian Routes	Refer to Design codes in relation to Cycle/pedestrian paths and parking	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED

Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 6 West Midlands Police	Page 45 Light Pollution Policy E5	Seeks rephrasing of Policy E5 to remove possible conflict between light pollution minimisation and public safety	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 6 West Midlands Police	Page 49 Heritage Assets Policy Q1	Seeks rephrasing of Policy Q1 to plan heritage materials carefully to minimise the temptation of theft	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 6 West Midlands Police	Page 49 Policy Q2	Update Design Code (Extensive detail provided on this)	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Statutory Consultee	Statutory Consultee 7 Coal Board	General	No comments	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 1 Catney Residents' Association	Figure 5 and 15	Plan boundary looks wrong.	Factual Correction	Aligns with boundaries in Solihull LP.	No changes made
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 1 Catney Residents' Association	Throughout document	Several drafting improvements suggested	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 1 Catney Residents' Association	Environmental Policies	Address battery storage and solar panels. Refer to SMBC Council motion 7/2	Request for change	Agreed	AMENDED
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 1 Catney Residents' Association	Para 3.10	Housing numbers incorrect	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 1 Catney Residents' Association	Figure 16	Plan boundary looks wrong.	Factual Correction	Aligns with boundaries in Solihull LP.	No changes made
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 1 Catney Residents' Association	Page 34	Update Design Code	Factual Correction	Agreed	AMENDED
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 1 Catney Residents' Association	General	Address how to access Solihull Local Plan	Clarity Suggestion	Agreed	AMENDED
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 2 Hampton Society	General	Fully Supportive.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 3 Fentham Trust	General	Fully Supportive.	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 3 Fentham Trust	Infrastructure	Should refer to concerns that the school is close to capacity	Comment	Agreed	AMENDED

Non- Statutory Consultee	Non Statutory Consultee 3 Fentham Trust	Housing	Should refer to Almshouses as sort of housing needed	Comment	Not backed up strongly in survey data.	No changes made
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non- Statutory Consultee 4 HS2	General	No comments	Comment	Noted	No changes made
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non- Statutory Consultee5 Pegasus	Figure 14	MSA Proposed site plan is wrong	Factual Correction	Will check and amend as necessary	AMENDED
Non- Statutory Consultee	Non- Statutory Consultee 6 Hampton Probus Club	Noise Pollution	Needs more emphasis on minimising noise from road infrastructure	Comment	Noted	No changes made