

Sections 1 - 5		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE AT LAUNCH OF DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 25/11/17</b> (No questions/comments as not Policy specific)		
<b>MENTIMETER</b>		
Just to say a huge thank you to the KDBH Forum active members who have put so much work into this Plan.	Noted. No action.	
The item 3.7 transport requires updating as evening and Sunday buses are listed in the current timetable. trains replace buses on Sun night	Clarified evening/weekend services for S2/S3. Added detail on 87 and 88 services.	Y
I fully support NP in objecting to scale of the planned developments in Knowle. But accept the need for more housing for young people	Noted. No action.	
Support. If housing permission given for housing Developers must give evidence of funding details for new school to be built.	Noted. No action.	
I support the policy	Noted. No action.	
5.3 Proposed new developments - seem to show massive over- provision. Good design and low density essential as is adequate parking	The large scale (1050+) new developments are proposed by Solihull Council as part of their Draft Local Plan, not by the NP. The Neighbourhood Forum is challenging these proposals. It has provided evidence through an independent KDBH Housing Needs Assessment study, independently undertaken using Central Government approved methodology and the Council's own statistical approach, that resulted in a much lower number of new homes ('around 500' excluding windfall developments), per Policy H1.	
Overall I support the local plan and what it is trying to achieve.	Noted. No action.	
Traffic congestion is already a major issue on a narrow High Street. The level of exhaust fumes at busy periods is unsafe for pedestrians	The Neighbourhood Forum has been instrumental in pressing SMBC to undertake transport and landscape studies to identify the impact of its proposed housing allocations in KDBH, and what this means in terms of constraints and any required infrastructure investment to address issues identified. Also for this analysis to be included as an essential requirement for the next phase of SMBC consultation on their Draft Local Plan. The Transport survey has been undertaken - including key KDBH traffic 'pinch points' identified by the Forum based on resident feedback - and is now being analysed by SMBC.	
Section 3. 'distinctly rural' in character - how does that square with agreeing to 500 -1050 houses being agreed plus windfall developments.	Noted. No action.	
Section 4. Build carehomes and houses for young and old people to free up the larger houses or make Arden Triangle a retirement village.	Two equally important objectives targeted through the NP are: 1) to enable older people to move into specialist accommodation (carehomes) or to downsize more easily should they wish; and 2) to create more opportunity for younger people to afford a home in KDBH, eg providing 'starter homes'. To meet these joint aims, it would be inappropriate to use a space the size Arden Triangle (on which SMBC seek to allocate 750 houses) as a Retirement Village.	
Section 5 - Support. Why not defend the green belt now not allow significant housing and then defend it - too late. Stop Arden Triangle.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action needed.	
5.3 Proposed new developments - seem to show massive over- provision. Good design and low density essential as is adequate parking	See response above re. 'massive over provision'.	
Do not support the need for a new relocated senior school.	Noted. Resident feedback is mixed on the pros and cons of a new secondary school. However, until Solihull Council issue their update Draft Local Plan for the next stage of consultation (originally scheduled for Spring 2017), any of their draft proposals may change. The Neighbourhood Forum will continue to represent KDBH resident and business views on new development in KDBH as a separate (but related) activity to developing the Neighbourhood Plan. We will re-commence this work once the updated SMBC Draft Local Plan is issued for consultation.	
Overall I support the local plan and what it is trying to achieve.	Noted. No action.	
The policy does accurate reflect the needs of the residents. It is biased to the elderly who have time to input to the policy	The challenges of engaging younger members of the community in activities such as Neighbourhood Planning is universal - as confirmed by the specialist and independent consultant from Stratford Council who undertook our surveys and summed up the outcome of our surveys as 'Responses exceeded all expectation so you will be building the Plan on very accurate and robust data'. Note also that the population profile of KDBH is skewed towards 30+ year olds, with an average age of 46.66 years (given eg. the high cost of housing in the Area). Hence, it is unsurprising that a relatively higher proportion of older people have contributed their input. The Neighbourhood Forum is required to demonstrate that it has done all it reasonably can (within limited budget and resources) to engage with all sectors of the community. This has been an area of huge focus for us, as evidenced in our Consultation Statement document. We are proud of what we have achieved, with strong support from over 900 Forum members/subscribers, through active collaboration with a wide range of community groups and through use of on-line technologies to appeal to younger people. We now have nearly 1,000 people in our Facebook community which typically comprises younger families.	
Lack of recognition for improved cycle access and reduce the use of cars. We need to get people on their feet it creates a better community	This point is indeed recognised within the NP - see Policies T6, Walking Infrastructure and T7, Cycling Infrastructure - both aimed at improving these facilities as part of any new development.	
I am extremely concerned that the NP's perspective and policies are heavily skewed towards the needs of elder members of KDBH.	See note above re. bias to elderly. Throughout it's work, the Neighbourhood Forum has always sought to represent a balanced approach across all those who have participated in the development of Neighbourhood Plan. It would be entirely inappropriate to try and 'second guess' what the views and needs are of those who have not participated.	
Failure to state plan to designate area within Arden boundary as Local Green Space in sections 1-5 undermines the whole consultation.	Incorrect. We follow the prescribed document structure, as defined in Government guidelines, where the aim of Sections 1-5 is to set out the background, context and high level vision and objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan. Each of the following Sections 6-12 then sets out the detail for each major topic area - hence VC4 Green Space sets out the details of proposed designated Local Green Space.	

Sections 1 - 5		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
I oppose the plan to designate area in front of Arden academy as local green space. Were the school consulted/advised of this plan?	Noted. The proposal to include part of the front of Arden Academy was included in the Draft NP with the agreement of the Headmaster. The consultation generated a lot of feedback regarding Local Green Space across KDBH. We are therefore undertaking a more comprehensive analysis for discussion with Members prior to updating the Draft NP for the next stage of consultation.	
Housing sections too skewed towards elderly residents; we have many new care/retirement homes. 'Shoebbox' ref is unprofessional & out of place	Housing proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan draw on the KDBH-specific Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) undertaken by an independent consultant using Government approved methodologies that Neighbourhood Plans must use. This approach includes eg. projecting the KDBH population profile over the term of the NP (to 2033) to assess what future housing needs will be, as well as sounding out local estate agents on their views. This independent analysis highlighted the need for a large amount of additional housing for the elderly, given both KDBH's higher age profile and the general trend for people to live longer. However, recognising the level of recent new development of specialist accommodation for the elderly, we have slightly reduced future requirements against those set out in the HNA.	
I support the focus on education, community facilities & life learning. This should be focus of plan, not parking & focus on elderly		
If NF anticipates ~500 houses then how do we ensure community gets max benefit from these. Would like to see NF supporting Arden 2020 vision	The Neighbourhood Forum represents the views of its Members (those who live, work or run a business in KDBH). Membership is currently divided on the relative pros and cons of the Arden Triangle proposals. We await issue of Solihull Council's updated Draft Local Plan for formal consultation as a firm basis to re-sound out community views on any proposed development including a new school.	
Street parking serves to limit vehicle speeds through KDBH e.g. Lodge, Station, Kenilworth, Hampton, Widney Rds. Stop parking=higher speeds	Noted. No action.	
I do not believe 80% of residents see parking as the top priority. NF have always offered this as top line in surveys w/ introduces bias	All of our policies are built on evidence. For example, both the Residents' and Business Surveys, undertaken by an independent 3rd party survey specialist, highlight parking as one of the top issues. This has been a consistent theme throughout all our consultations with residents, in whatever form.	
I support all comments.	Noted. No action.	
3.3. Population Profile tips towards older people who can afford to live in the villages. More balance needed.	See notes above re. bias to elderly.	
Younger home owners bring vibrancy to an area	Neighbourhood Plan seeks to address the needs of younger home owners, eg. through policies to deliver more smaller properties as 'starter homes' and affordable housing.	
4.2 Agree need for appropriate housing for long term residents who wish to remain in the area post retirement.	Noted. No action.	
4.4 Agree parking is an issue and lack of parking will not encourage people to use more local businesses and shops. Can we have spaces that (feedback stops here)	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action needed.	
Added point - Lack of litter bin facilities in the area which seems to result in waste being dumped in gardens and hedges.	The statutory remit of a Neighbourhood Plan deals with matters relating to new development and land use. Consider as part of 'Community Actions' in discussion with Residents Associations other local community groups.	
Agree there is an issue with school drop off and pick up causing considerable congestion and safety issues at this time.	Noted. No action.	
Add point - Lack of pedestrian crossings on Widney Road and particularly a problem on the junction of Tilehurst Green Lane and Widney Road.	The statutory remit of a Neighbourhood Plan deals with matters relating to new development and land use. Consider as part of 'Community Actions' in discussion with Residents Associations other local community groups.	
Green waste bins finish too early in the season. Excess leaves on pavements can be a safety issues and encourages dog fouling too.	The statutory remit of a Neighbourhood Plan deals with matters relating to new development and land use. Consider as part of 'Community Actions' in discussion with Residents Associations other local community groups.	
Council could support with more street sweepers during leaf fall and encourage residents to clear their frontage.	The statutory remit of a Neighbourhood Plan deals with matters relating to new development and land use. Consider as part of 'Community Actions' in discussion with Residents Associations other local community groups.	
Agree public transport is weak and worse now than prior	Noted. No action.	
KDBH should be an aspirational location and community be careful to not over develop the area with cheap housing.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action needed.	
I generally support VC1 - 5.	Noted. No action.	
I support the policy. It is well considered realistic yet allows the development that is needed.	Noted. No action.	
I strongly agree with the Vision Statement. I am 40 yrs old with 2 children under 6. I moved here in 2014 & support the Plans intentions.	Noted. No action.	
I also recognise & appreciate the effort that has gone to preparing this plan. Thank you	Noted. No action.	
I do not support the green space in front of Arden becoming a designated Local Green Space if it means we cannot provide the new school	Following the range of feedback received from the consultation, we are undertaking a more detailed review of Local Green Space.	Y
However I am strongly in support of the plan generally as long as we have designated clean cycling routes for safe school travel without car	See policies ECF2: Location of New Schools targeting new or improved cycling routes where new or expanded school(s) development is proposed ; and, more generally, T7: Cycling Infrastructure.	
I think you have tried to keep the over all goal	Noted. No action.	
<b>VIA WEBSITE</b>		
Just a technical point – the red line on the map on p37 shows the ward boundary north of M42 , not the Neighbourhood area boundary, which is M42.	Due to formatting changes in the update to the Neighbourhood Plan, we removed this graphic.	Y
I would wish to congratulate those responsible for producing what I regard as an excellent Draft Neighbourhood Plan that represents well the evidence base and subsequent policies and values within the constraints that have become apparent. Just a few comments, the first few of which are trivial.	Every little helps!	
Spelling noticed in passing. Page 9, 4.1 Scale of Development – exacerbating.	Agree. Plan amended	Y
My aversion to unattached comparisons:	Noted. No action.	
Page 9, 4.2 - last sentence of first section might be expressed as: In short, there is a need to provide an appropriate mix of housing types in KDBH to meet future needs.	Agree. Plan amended	Y
Page 14, first bullet point after the table might be expressed as: the community has (some) control of future development in their Neighbourhood, ...	Agree. Plan amended	Y
More substantial points: Some confusion in the two mentions of St George and St Teresa RC Primary School (note correct title).	Agree. Plan amended	Y

Sections 1 - 5		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
On page 8, paragraph 3.8, first sentence: there is no relevant reason why the school should be mentioned as separate to the three other primary schools. Better and more straightforward to read that there are four primary schools, possibly with some indication of status for each one.	Agree. Plan amended	Y
Transport 3.7. The 87 and 88 Services run approximately hourly on weekdays with no Sunday service;	Agree. Plan amended	Y
S3.8 - The term is Scout Group, not club;	Agree. Plan amended	Y
INTRODUCTION: These reps focus on how the Knowle, Dorridge & Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Plan (KDBHNP) addresses the need to accommodate growth in the area and how criteria for the selection of sites for new development are evidenced and defined. Therefore the reps focus on Policy H2 though comment is also necessarily made on the contextual matters that underpin it. PRINCIPLES: The appropriate level of growth that could be accommodated in the KDBHNP area should be set not by a contrived arithmetic that relates to the needs of the wider housing market area but by reference to local character, opportunities and constraints - in essence, a bottom up rather than top down approach to policy development. Adopting this philosophy would point to a focus on recognising existing & ensuring future quality in landscape & new development and also on ensuring deliverability in a way that does not have unmanageable impacts both on & around the site but also on the neighbourhood as a whole. Therefore both site specific and cumulative impacts to be considered.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action needed.	
POLICY DEVELOPMENT: First, the special qualities of the area need to be identified. A good start has been made in this regard with the commissioning of a Heritage & Character Assessment and Design Coding Study. However it is noted that both documents have yet to be finalised and so the process of KDBHNP amendment following the current consultation will need to take into account their ultimate findings & recommendations.	The NF team worked closely with the consultant undertaking both of the studies mentioned. We reviewed and agreed the findings from both reports in the later stages of developing the Draft Neighbourhood Plan. However, we were unable to formally publish the full reports as they needed final sign off from the Government body responsible for commissioning and overseeing this type of technical support for Neighbourhood Forums. So the Draft Neighbourhood Plan already reflects the findings and recommendations of the two studies - notably within Sections 6 and 8. Both have now received sign off and are available (as required) for the next stage of Formal Consultation.	Y
Secondly, it requires a recognition that substantial new development will necessitate the outward extension of the built up area, breaching existing & creating new edges to Knowle and other settlements. Some of these existing edges provide the landscape setting to the historic settlements of Knowle and should be protected both for their own sake and in line with one of the purposes of designating Green Belts as set out in para 80 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) ie. "to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns". Equally, new edges need to be carefully considered as different contexts will require different treatments. Vague references to the transition between urban & rural areas in the Draft KDBHNP miss this vital point and further work to fill this vacuum in policy development is needed.	More detail is provided in the Heritage and Character Assessment and the Masterplanning/Design and Design Coding Studies, mentioned above, that form part of our Evidence Base for Formal Consultation.	Y
With regard to deliverability, assessing & managing impacts on the local road networks and on managing flood risk are basic requirements of any proposed development. However a Neighbourhood Plan also needs to consider cumulative impacts and here the increase in traffic volumes on the highway network and on key junctions within it needs careful assessment. However no detailed analysis in this regard has yet been published. Further and of no lesser importance is the impact of increased volumes on the historic environment - for example how increased traffic volumes might affect the vitality & viability of environment - for example how increased traffic volumes might affect the vitality & viability of the High Street of Knowle and so impact on the preservation & maintenance of historic buildings in the Conservation Area). However no serious analysis of this issue has been published and the necessary work needs to be put in hand as soon as possible.	We absolutely agree with your point, which relates to the impact of SMBC's Draft Local Plan proposals to allocate two large sites for housing development in Knowle. Indeed, the NF has been very active in campaigning on this matter, in parallel with developing the Neighbourhood Plan (NP), resulting in SMBC working with us to undertake a transport impact assessment for KDBH that incorporates potential issues highlighted through our surveys and resident feedback. It is however very important to note that work relating to SMBC's Draft Local Plan is a separate (albeit related) activity to development of the NP. Development of the Draft Local Plan still has a long way to go. Until the Council moves their proposals to the next stage of formal consultation (originally planned for Spring 2017, now Summer / Autumn 2018), anything could change in terms of eg. proposed sites and number of houses. It will be at least a further year (more likely more) before the Local Plan completes all the required processes and becomes a firm basis for planning. In the interim, our goal is to ensure that KDBH benefits as soon as possible from the wide protections that a Neighbourhood Plan provides, which apply to <i>any</i> new development (eg. including windfalls). Given the extent of delay already experienced on SMBC's Draft Local Plan (for a variety of reasons), our approach has been to press ahead and complete Neighbourhood Plan as quickly as possible. Our focus has been to create an Evidence Base that provides a robust basis to challenge SMBC's proposals and to incorporate policies to manage any large scale new development that may result from the Local Plan. This includes specific policies to address concerns with the impact of new development on Transport Infrastructure, eg. Policy 9.6 Transport Assessments and Travel Plans requiring all planning applications likely to generate significant traffic volumes to clearly identify what the impacts are and how they will be accommodated.	
5.3 Under Housing, objective should be amended to read "Plan for appropriate and proportionate growth ..."	Agree. Plan amended	Y
Under Village Character amend the wording to read "Safeguard our natural environment, enhance biodiversity, maintain a high quality landscape both for its own sake and for the setting it provides for historic settlements and ensure that the edges of settlements meet appropriately with the countryside"	Agree. Plan amended	Y
IMPLICATIONS FOR SOLIHULL LOCAL PLAN REVIEW As noted above, the Principles, commentary on Policy Development and the policy directions set out above should guide the interplay between the development of Local and Neighbourhood Plan development and in particular the consideration of the need for and the selection & detailed boundary definition of any proposed strategic land releases.	Noted. No action.	

Sections 1 - 5		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p>We have been residents of Dorridge and Knowle for 25 years or more. We do not support the draft NP as it stands. We have found it very time consuming to try and successfully use the on-line feedback system so although we have made some individual policy points there, we have summarised the more general issues here. It is very difficult for us to categorically endorse the current draft NP when so much of the evidence is incomplete. In The Heritage and Character assessment Study and the Masterplanning Design and Design Coding Study. Notwithstanding the outcome of those we support the general Policy Drivers 'avoiding housing on large Greenbelt Sites' and 'protecting the landscape' but it is difficult to see where in the Plan these issues are being followed through particularly as it seems the Forum has been cooperating with SMBC in attempts to 'Masterplan' the Hampton Road and Arden Triangle sites against the evidence of its own surveys. We also contributed to the request for funding by the Forum which we thought was intended to provide 'independent' Transport/Parking and Landscape Assessments to inform the NP. There was no sign that this money was being used as intended and again, if it is in hand, the evidence it provides should be used to formulate Plan policies. We do not deny that Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath may have to take on significant numbers of new houses, perhaps even more than the Forum's own independent advice. However we feel that the Forum may be ignoring the cost in the longer terms of giving up quality historic Arden landscape in favour of dispersing some of the new housing allocations to less sensitive and more sustainable locations which would allow for organic growth around the settlements and relieve some of the inevitable potential pressure on Road and Transport infrastructure and Knowle Village Centre.</p>	<p>See note above re. the Heritage and Character Assessment and Masterplanning Design and Design Coding Studies.</p> <p>Nationally and locally, there is a drive to involve Parish Councils and Neighbourhood Forums earlier in the planning process, and this is seen as a positive development. In this context, the KDBH Neighbourhood Forum team has sought to be involved as early as possible in understanding more detail around what is being proposed for each of the two proposed allocated sites. For all parties - SMBC, Developers and the Forum - these discussions are 'without prejudice', i.e. they do not signal any form of approval to the proposed developments. To date, we have been involved in two meetings regarding the Hampton Road site; we have had no involvement in anything relating to Arden Triangle despite all our efforts.</p> <p>This approach achieves two important goals: 1) it enables us to provide greater transparency to Forum members on what is being discussed, and to seek their views; 2) it enables us to highlight early on issues of concern to KDBH residents and to flag emerging policies from the Neighbourhood Plan and how these may relate to the development. That is to say, it emphasises (not goes against) the evidence of our surveys.</p> <p>See note above regarding progress on the Transport Survey, which has now been undertaken by SMBC with our involvement. This was our top priority in terms of the crowdfunding available, that unfortunately was insufficient to do both the Transport and Landscape studies. With the Transport work now well in hand, we can clearly define the scope of work on the Landscape study knowing the funding available. This is currently being commissioned.</p> <p>Far from 'ignoring the cost' on landscape, we are actively representing Forum Member views on the impact of SMBC site allocations and housing numbers. As explained above, however, this is a separate activity to development of the Neighbourhood Plan, in the early stages of development and subject change.</p> <p>When SMBC were consulting on their Draft Local Plan in January 2016, the Neighbourhood Forum did put forward an alternative approach looking at dispersed sites. There was no appetite from Forum members to pursue this option. Note also that there are less than a handful of brownfield sites in KDBH that between them would provide potential for fewer than 100 new houses. All other sites are Green Belt, which can only be released for significant development by the Local Authority.</p>	
<p>On a general note, we understand from discussion at the meeting yesterday, that this Draft Neighbourhood Plan is just a first step in a consultation process and that the wording of Para 1.5, Plan Period, Monitoring and Review, is to be amended. This will give an opportunity for residents' views on all issues to be incorporated into the report in the detail they deserve.</p>	<p>Section 1.5 states 'We expect to provide an updated version of this Neighbourhood Plan to SMBC for formal consultation to start in 2018, with Referendum in summer 2018.' We have slightly amended this to make it clear that there is an opportunity to provide further feedback on the updated Neighbourhood Plan as part of the formal consultation process.</p>	Y
<p>On a general note, we understand from discussion at the meeting yesterday, that this Draft Neighbourhood Plan is just a first step in a consultation process and that the wording of Para 1.5, Plan Period, Monitoring and Review, is to be amended. This will give an opportunity for residents' views on all issues to be incorporated into the report in the detail they deserve.</p>	<p>As above.</p>	Y
<p>I appreciate all the work involved in pulling such a comprehensive document together and thank all of those involved for the time and effort they have invested in developing this draft plan. I welcome such engaged community. I am delighted to see that continued high-quality education, access to schools of choice, opportunities for life-long learning and community facilities continue to be a priority for local residents and are given a high-profile in the draft Plan.</p>		
<p>I wish to respond to the Draft KDBH Neighbourhood Plan. I have responded via the website but found it extremely cumbersome, difficult to navigate and, due to the limited word count, restrictive. Several people I have spoken to have found the same, with some being put off from responding at all. This accessibility issue leaves questions as to the adequacy, effectiveness and hence compliance of what I understand is a statutory consultation. I thank you for all the time and effort that the team have put into developing the plan to this stage and recognise the many positive aspects of the draft plan. However, I feel these are undermined by a poorly designed feedback interface, a number of key omissions and (based on current available information) badly evidenced conclusions/proposals surrounding some fundamental elements of the plan. These leave me with concerns about the integrity of the overall consultation process.</p>	<p>Sorry to hear that you had difficulty providing feedback on-line (a major source of feedback for us). We recognise that people have different needs and preferences, which is why we also provided a dedicated e-mail address that respondents could use, as well as a feedback box in Knowle library for people to drop in paper-based responses. In addition, the Neighbourhood Plan Policy Exhibition held at Arden Academy on 25 November provided a way for people to review policies, ask questions face to face and provide written feedback via a questionnaire.</p> <p>There will be another opportunity to provide feedback when the updated Draft Neighbourhood Plan proceeds to the next stage, Formal Consultation, which is run by Solihull Council. They will no doubt be able to provide a more sophisticated on line feedback mechanism that we, as a voluntary body with limited funds and resources, cannot.</p>	
<p>P9-12, Section 4: Presumably all of the key issue boxes are intended to be red text?</p>	<p>The different colours are intentional as a way of grouping each policy area.</p>	
<p>P10 4.2 Affordable Homes for People: I don't understand "pepper-potting" and "blind tenure" suggest this needs rewording.</p>	<p>Sorry for the jargon there. We have provided an explanation and included the definition in the Glossary.</p>	Y
<p>P10 4.3: Issue is described as poor design standards in recent developments, but nowhere is this detailed, in terms of which developments and what specific design weaknesses. This should be described and explained.</p>	<p>We have identified some 'good' and 'bad' developments and included some photographs.</p>	Y
<p>Section 4 overall: I think that some of these objectives are conflicting, which makes some of the document illogical. For example I don't believe that you can maintain a "village atmosphere and environment" whilst at the same time assume that buildings will be available for e.g. "lifetime learning"; "increased commuter parking"; availability of "indoor and outdoor facilities for improved wellbeing". Any such contradictions are due to the nature of the segmented document not mentioned / ignored. There is no recognition in the text or specific policy comments regarding the difficulties that balancing all the stated aims and objectives will necessarily entail.</p>	<p>Agreed it will be a challenge, but is the inherent nature of all planning to balance competing pressures and demands.</p>	

Sections 1 - 5		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
I feel that the local authority have little interest in hearing what this well proposed document has to suggest . The interest by local conflicted councillors proves just that thus the local people have no confidence that their views will be listened to . I like the max of 500 houses but the views of Ian Courts were that he considers that KD&BH need many more than that . The Arden School proposals are cost impossible and merely serve to confuse all who consider them. Fertive activity of other land owners who have ambitions to develop large tracts in Arden Triangle and in Hampton Road are unhelpful as they conflict with the local plan -a result of their greed . transport gets a fair shout ,local amenities are severely under pressure and will be more so as the impossible traffic targets expected of M42 increase and invite traffic to "rat Run" through the villages .	Noted. No action.	
There is no acknowledgement of the law and order issues that prevail currently as the recent crime explosion of car theft and burglary in our area has no place in the document -what about a local police station ?	Following consultation feedback from West Midlands Police, we have incorporated some crime preventions aspects in the updated Neighbourhood Plan, eg. ECF4.  A new police station is out of scope for the NP, but may be something the KDBH want to consider as a Community Action.	Y
Employment is only partly covered with no mention of those employed in agriculture who will lose their livelihoods when the fields are swallowed up by the housing !!	Given what we currently know of SMBC's current proposals for site allocation, agriculture is not significantly affected.	
Parking has no solution at the station ,on Sainsbury's ,in Knowle etc . and needs a real in depth consideration as the opportunity to dispense with the car is not optioned by a better local public transport facility .	A Neighbourhood Plan's remit covers land use related to new development. In the short term, we can (and have) provided objective evidence that highlights existing issues so as to ensure that, as a minimum, these are not exacerbated by new development. However, policies within the Neighbourhood Plan only kick in with new development, providing the trigger to look at ways to better manage overall growth in KDBH.	
Sorry some of this is negative but it is a realistic overview which I know is shared by many who have shown no interest in the KD&Bh plan . they feel the dies are already cast at council level and at WMCA level .	We can understand why some people may feel like this. However, Neighbourhood Planning provides legal powers for communities to have a more direct say over future development in their Neighbourhoods, and continues to be given more powers by Central Government.  Based on what we know, the NF team is sufficiently convinced to have committed three years to put Neighbourhood Planning to the test, and have worked hard to encourage as many as possible in our community to give just a little of their time to see what can be achieved together. Let's face it, it's certainly better than doing nothing and simply allowing the Local Authority to determine future plans for us without the legal force of a Neighbourhood Forum, as a statutory body, to ensure that community needs carry real weight.	
I am writing on behalf of Arden Academy Board of Governors in response to the published Draft KDBH Neighbourhood Plan. We appreciate all the work involved in pulling such a comprehensive document together and thank all of those involved for the time and effort they have invested in developing this draft plan. We welcome such engaged community activity and it is this community spirit that Arden seeks hard to support through its excellent education programme for our young people and its support of the wider community. We are certain that our excellent and vibrant school sits at the very heart of community and we continue to be extremely supportive of the energy of the KDBHNF. We are delighted to see that continued high-quality education, access to schools of choice, opportunities for life-long learning and community facilities continue to be a priority for local residents and are given a high-profile in the draft Plan. As you know, the Arden 2020 Vision has been specifically developed to help address these issues and we look forward to working with you to turn this vision into reality for the good of the whole community.	Noted. No action.	
1) At 61 pages this document could be considered too long.		
2) Housing type and size in paragraph 4.2 does not collate with the survey findings exactly, which wanted to maintain 3/ 4 bedroom houses as a priority.	This reflects both the survey findings and the findings from the KDBH Housing Needs Study. 75% of responses to the Residents' survey indicated that 2 bed properties were very or quite suitable for KDBH (versus 92% for 3 bed and 85% for 4 bed). It also takes into consideration the strong support for smaller units as 'starter homes'.	
3) Downsizing while good as a principle will not happen because wealthy single occupants need not and do not want to move from where there families grew up. (lots of examples) 4) Specialist housing seems to be well catered for with recent developments at Bentley Heath and Knowle. Market forces will probably deliver the care homes currently at £1600-00 per week 5) Under 4.4 there is lots of reference to survey findings on parking, but does it add anything? 6) Section 5.3 - A lot of residents will get this far in the text and go no further as reading gets heavier from the next section onwards. Bullet point 1 - OK Bullet point 2 - this might be better worded to the effect that housing needs have been advised by our community and supported by the independent housing needs survey. (as stated previously I don't think there is support for downsizing) Bullet point 3 - OK Bullet point 4 - how will car parking be improved with better availability and fewer restrictions? Bullet point 5 - OK if money is spent there. Bullet point 6 - I know we mention a business centre but I am not sure we can claim there will be more businesses. Bullet point 8 - OK . Bullet point 9 - OK . Bullet point 10 - The council have from the outset stated that there is no money for roads. At best Witchwood Roundabout	Your comments on downsizing may certainly be true for some, but not all. The need to consider downsizing needs is one of the aspects highlighted by local estate agents.  All headings in Section 4 summarise current issues in each topic area drawing on the relevant parts of our Evidence Base (ie. rather than requiring readers to read all of the supporting documentation). This then provides the foundation for creating policies that address the issues identified. Section 4.4, Parking, is one of the major themes.  Section 5.3 describes the high level objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan, with the detail as to how that may be achieved provided in the subsequent Policy Sections.	
<b>VIA LIBRARY</b>		
No comments		

<b>Sections 1 - 5</b>		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>SMBC</b>		
1.1 Overall, the pre-submission draft Plan is well presented and clearly structured. The Vision, Objectives and Policies are clearly set out and the document reads well and is easy to navigate. The Council is generally supportive of and welcomes many of the aims and objectives of the policies, particularly those relating to design, village character and natural environment. However, it is recommended that the evidence base referred to in support of the development of the Neighbourhood Plan be published on a dedicated page on the KDBH website. This would ensure that it can be easily accessed and scrutinised.	Agreed and added	
Conclusion 1.50 In summary and notwithstanding the above points, it is to be welcomed that the Neighbourhood Forum has taken on board many of the informal comments from officers throughout the process so far. It is clear that an enormous amount of work has gone into drafting the plan and this is to be commended. However, in order for the plan to meet the basic conditions, including the need to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan, the above comments should be addressed. 1.51 The Council's response to this formal pre-submission consultation is intended to further assist in the development of an effective and deliverable Neighbourhood Plan for KDBH. The Council looks forward to on-going dialogue with the Neighbourhood Forum through to formal submission of the Neighbourhood Plan.	Various changes have been made to the NP. It is considered to be in general conformity with the development plan.	Y
<b>OFFICIAL CONSULTEES</b>		
Kenilworth Town Council notes your consultation with thanks and appreciates being kept informed. However, we have no comments to make at this stage.	Noted. No action.	
Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath Draft Neighbourhood Plan 2018 –2033 Pre-Submission Consultation: Formal Representations on behalf of West Midlands Police Chief Constable. We act for the <b>Chief Constable of West Midlands Police (CCWMP)</b> and are instructed to make representations on local development documents in respect of securing policy reference in such documents to matters including: · Recognising the community need for securing safe environments with crime reduction made a priority; · Requiring developers to demonstrate how proposals address community safety and crime prevention in Design & Access Statements, or other relevant planning application documents; · Ensuring the timely and effective engagement of the police and other emergency services to ensure effective delivery of infrastructure projects required as a result of development growth with the recognition that the police are a social infrastructure delivery agency; · In appropriate cases, seeking financial contributions towards the additional expenditure burden placed on West Midlands Police as a consequence of development proposals and growth; and · Ensuring the timely and effective engagement of the police and other emergency services in the planning processes in relation to matters likely to affect crime and fear of crime. The CCWMP has a statutory duty to secure the maintenance of an efficient and effective police force for its area and Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (MBC) is statutorily required to consider crime and disorder and community safety in the exercise of its duties with the aim of achieving a reduction in crime.	Noted. No action.	
<b>Cont.</b> Neighbourhood Plans, once 'made', become part of the Council's development plan and these documents should therefore consider crime and disorder with polices aimed at reducing crime and the fear of crime, in line with national and Local Plan policies. The CCWMP is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath Draft Neighbourhood Plan (KDBHNP) Pre-Submission Consultation. Comments are set out below: Planning Policy Background 1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, paragraph 156 sets out the strategic priorities for local planning authorities, including, 'the provision of health, security, community and cultural infrastructure...' Security is therefore a national strategic planning objective for local authorities. 2. Paragraph 58 in subsection 7, Requiring Good Design states, 'Local and neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies and set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area... Planning policies should aim to ensure that developments...create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion...' 3. This message is reemphasised in paragraph 69 in subsection 8, Promoting Healthy Communities, which states, 'The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities...Planning policies and decisions, in turn, should aim to achieve places which promote:...safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas.'	Noted. No action.	

Sections 1 - 5		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p><b>Cont. 4.</b> Paragraph 17, requires local authorities as one of their 'Core Planning Principles', to 'take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.' This would include the requirement for appropriate levels of police infrastructure are provided and maintained to meet the needs of the community. 5. The national 'Planning Practice Guidance' (PPG), paragraph 10 (Reference ID: 26-010-20140306) is sub-titled 'Planning should address crime prevention'. It states that 'Designing out crime and designing in community safety should be central to the planning and delivery of new development.' It emphasises that it is important that crime reduction-based planning measures are based upon a clear understanding of the local situation and consideration needs to be given to how planning policies relate to wider policies on crime reduction, crime prevention and sustainable communities. 6. Paragraph 003 (Reference ID: 41-003-20140306) explains that to help deliver their vision communities that have a 'made' neighbourhood plan or Order will benefit from 25% of the revenues from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) arising from the development that takes place in their area. The use of neighbourhood funds should match priorities expressed by local communities, including priorities set out formally in neighbourhood plans.</p>	Noted. No action.	
<p><b>Cont. 7.</b> Paragraph 045 (Reference ID: 41-045-20140306) suggests that the neighbourhood plan body may wish to consider what infrastructure needs to be provided in their neighbourhood area alongside development such as homes, shops or offices. It emphasises that '...infrastructure is needed to support development and ensure that a neighbourhood can grow in a sustainable way...' The PPG states that '...Qualifying bodies should engage infrastructure providers...in this process...' Paragraph 46 (Reference ID: 41-046-20140306) goes on to explain that, '...A qualifying body should set out in their draft neighbourhood plan the prioritised infrastructure required to address the demands of the development identified in the plan...' 8. Paragraph 71 of the PPG (Reference ID: 25-071-20140612) explains that the levy can be used to fund a wide range of infrastructure, '...including police stations and other community safety facilities...' This flexibility gives local areas the opportunity to choose what infrastructure they need to deliver their Plan. 9. Paragraph 78 of the PPG (Reference ID: 25-078-20140612) emphasises that the neighbourhood portion of the levy can be spent on a wider range of things than the rest of the levy, provided that it meets the requirement to 'support the development of the area'. The wider definition means that the neighbourhood portion can be spent on, for example: the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.</p>	Noted. No action.	
<p><b>Cont. 10.</b> When an Inspector examines a Neighbourhood Plan it will be tested to establish whether or not it meets the 'basic conditions'. These include that it should: have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; and be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority. 11. At a local level, Solihull Local Plan, adopted December 2013, Policy P15 'Securing Design Quality' states that 'All development proposals will be expected to achieve good quality, inclusive and sustainable design, which meets the following key principles...vii. Creates attractive, safe, active, legible and uncluttered streets and public spaces which are accessible, easily maintained and encourage walking and cycling and reduce crime and the fear of crime...' The Policy goes on to require that '...Applicants should adhere to the urban design principles set out in established current design guidance, including... Secured by Design principles...' At paragraph 13.3.3 of the Local Plan, it states that the Council, '...are working with statutory delivery agencies to have the most up-to-date information on infrastructure requirements and to strive for multiple benefits from development where possible...' including working, '...with the West Midlands Police to deliver safe developments and communities.'</p>	Noted. No action.	
<p><b>Cont. 12.</b> The emerging Solihull Local Plan Review, draft published for consultation December 2016, Policy P15 continues to require consideration of crime and safety in design, it states proposals will be expected to '...Create attractive, safe, active, legible and uncluttered streets and public spaces which are accessible, inter-connected and easily maintained, and encourages walking and cycling and reduces crime and the fear of crime through the adoption of Secured by Design principles in all developments...' 13. At both a national and local planning policy level, there is therefore a recognised planning need for development to design-in crime prevention measures and design-out crime, as well as the need to plan for appropriate levels of infrastructure, such as street lighting and CCTV, which would be eligible for CIL funding.</p>	Noted. No action.	
<p><b>Cont. 14.</b> The CCWMP consider it is important that the need for additional community safety facilities arising from the proposed scale of development be included in the 'Objectives' table at paragraph 5.3, subsection 'Education and Community Facilities'. The statement could be amended as follows (changes shown in 'bold'):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure community facilities and services (including healthcare, sport and recreation, and <b>emergency services</b>) meet the needs of the diverse and growing community through protection of, investment in, and ongoing access to new and improved facilities in tandem with new housing growth.</li> </ul>	Agree. Plan amended	Y
<p><b>Cont. Conclusion</b></p> <p>31. The CCWMP urge the Neighbourhood Forum to recognise the importance of considering crime prevention in all appropriate policies and proposals within the NP. They advocate the introduction of policy wording which will promote the development of safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion. Amendments are sought to Policies VC3, D1 and ECF4, which will ensure consistency with national and local overarching planning policies and ensure that the NP meets the basic conditions.</p>	Policy VC3 and ECF4 updated,	Y

Sections 1 - 5		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
32. The CCWMP requests that the Neighbourhood Forum involve them in the plan making process on an on-going basis to establish potential infrastructure pressure points and future infrastructure needs as more detailed information on development proposals and the scale of growth are finalised. The CCWMP is keen that the KDBH NP formally recognise the need for S106/CIL revenue to be directed towards maintaining and improving community safety, in line with national and local planning policy objectives. The CCWMP and his representatives would be pleased to meet with you to discuss the matters raised in this letter of representation.	Noted. No action.	
<b>General Feedback from Exhibition via Post It Notes on Flip Chart</b>		
Thank you for looking after the interests of the local area.	Noted. No action.	
Solihull Council should be plugging the funding gap for Arden rebuild, not Green Belt.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDHP NP	
Why aren't Solihull Council funding Arden rebuild?	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDHP NP	
Thank you all for your hard work in this project.	Noted. No action.	
More housing needed near to work spaces NOT Green Belt.	Noted. No action.	
Consider use of empty building in Solihull to become housing.	Would need to be done by SMBC.	
We should use empty buildings, not Green Belt.	Per above.	
Well done. Great idea a new school.		
Please please make sure there provision for our Catholic children. Currently underfunded and in need of a site relocation.	Noted. No action.	
Thanks to all concerned for your hard work and dedication on our behalf.	Noted. No action.	
Ditto above. Clarity is superb.	Noted. No action.	
Very professional. Could you highlight more the crucial point re. number of houses. Think this may be lost in so much ????	Not clear if this relates to KDBH Policy H1 (a total of about 500 houses), or SMBC proposed allocation of 1050+ houses in Knowle. In the latter case (which we assume), see comments above re. SMBC Draft Local Plan.	
The area is fortunate to have such a hard working group looking after our interests.	Noted. No action.	
Excellent professional looking presentation. Very appreciated.	Noted. No action.	
A huge congrats and thanks to everyone who has worked on today. My only other feedback is that given the volume of information a summary sheet would have been very helpful.		
Too many houses.	Noted. No action.	
Well done, fantastic piece of work. Thank you.	Noted. No action.	
Absolutely! (to above)	Noted. No action.	
I agree completely.	Noted. No action.	
Love the proposal for the residents of the social housing to be local to the area.	Noted. No action.	
Good work but why no housing in Dorridge?	This decision is made by SMBC, who have set out their proposed housing allocations in KDBH as part of their Draft Local Plan.	
Agree. Good point. (to above)	Noted. No action.	
Where are the families. Are they not interested?	Noted. No action.	
We are here. (relating to above)	Noted. No action.	
Thank you for your hard work. An excellent Exhibition. Well done.	Noted. No action.	
I agree. (to above)	Noted. No action.	
Why no increased housing in Dorridge? They are the only ones with rail link.	This decision is made by SMBC, who have set out their proposed housing allocations in KDBH as part of their Draft Local Plan.	
This is a fine presentation, although I do feel strongly that SMBC will do exactly what they want, despite what we want!	Noted. No action.	
Policing and security.	Feedback from West Midlands Police incorporated into updated Neighbourhood Plan.	
Too many houses.	Noted. No action.	
We need more schools, parks and roads to support this huge no. of houses.	Noted. No action.	

Village Character and Natural Environment		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE AT LAUNCH OF DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 25/11/17</b>		
2 - Knowle / Dorridge are villages. Keep them as that not just another suburb of Solihull. Villages are green and with open spaces not a jumble of bricks and mortar.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
5 - VC4 There are many more sites that should be designated - will this be able to be done after the Neighbourhood Plan is in place? NE1 What is "the scheme" where can it be found?	Plan to be amended. Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully. Wording in NE1 'the scheme' needs to be clarified	Y
6 - All development needs to be brown field only.	Noted. This would be preferable but is not possible with the scale of housing required in Solihull. Should we make this clear in eg section 4.1	Y
7 - We need to try and preserve as many green spaces as possible. Especially trees / hedgerows and woodlands.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
17 - Cannot understand how Hedge House, Kenilworth Road (just past Elvers Green Lane) can be erected on 6.5 acres of Green Belt Land. This is a new development for one family.	Although close to Knowle this is not in our NP Area. It was approved by SMBC under a Planning Policy that allows isolated new homes in the countryside that are "truly outstanding"	
24 - Too many houses proposed for Arden Triangle. Do not want cramped estates.	See Policy H1 and ongoing engagement by the Forum with SMBC.	
28 - Green belt land should be protected.	See Policy VC1.	
31 - Such a shame that local shops have not been supported in the past and they have been lost. I remember at least 3 vegetable shops in Knowle - now none.	Noted. No action.	
33 - I have said yes to all but this will not allow space for developments. We would all like green fields to walk in but you can not have both. there asn't enough room. Use brown fill.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
37 - Why have Solihull Council allowed deterioration of Green Belt including large scale tree removal at Landsdown House, where they state Green Belt poor? Knowle Locks and the canal SSSI should be included in Green Space where they pass through KDBH and are a vital conservation area; also could be re-listed as a Heritage Asset.	Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully in Plan	Y
38 - Lansdowne tree removal despicable!	Noted. No action.	
42 - I am in favour of tree planting on new housing developments but would prefer to see native trees and not the 'lollipop' clones that are so often planted now.	Already in Plan under VC5	
46 - ? Separation of KDBH from Solihull - physical. Had a colleague back in 1970 who sold his house in Dorridge fearing the 2 were going to linked. He was a senior auditor. Station Drive - Victorian shops of no architectural value. Ugly.	Noted. No action.	
47 - Protect Green Belt at all costs. Need to protect green spaces but whilst nice to have more village green on the old Knowle Bypass corridor there has been no joined up thinking about how access would be provided to all the proposed developments. The Knowle bypass corridor has been there since 1960's, what an idiotic decision to cut off the only viable transport corridor to access Knowle, in particular the Arden Triangle area. We could enhance the centre of Knowle by reducing traffic. Transport Infrastructure needs to cater for new developments High Street and Lodge Road cannot cope with increased traffic. Need alternative road routes. Knowle Bypass?	Consideration of alternative traffic schemes for Knowle included in Community Actions, Appendix 3, Item 4b.	Y
48 - Protection of the environment is very important both natural and historic. The natural environment helps to offset the air pollution from M42 airport roads etc.	Noted. No action.	
52 - Car parking - space they utilise is the Main (only) issue. Had Sainsburys built a layer underground - they could have been persuaded !!! - we would have gained 100+ spaces. All new car parking must include Underground - it does not have a visual impact.	Consideration to be given to underground parking, where appropriate, added to Poicy T2.	Y
60 - This is a beautiful area but lets expand in a way that suits the area. Accept it and control it.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
62 - NE1 Development here should be resisted at all costs - as part of RHS Greening Britain Campaign.	Noted. We support this positive RHS campaign to make grey areas green	
67 - Green spaces should be protected.	Noted. No action.	
68 - I would like to see the unattractive dreary walk-way through to the High St in Knowle from the car park at the back of One Stop , Bank etc.	Noted. Improvement of this walk-way could be pursued under Community Actions, VC&NE, 1c.	
71 - Needs greater emphasis on protecting Green Belt, and the green infrasture around Knowle. The Hampton Rd and Knowle Triangle development encroach into these and should be resisted or scaled back - build in Dorridge and Bentley Heath as well.	Although the current proposals are in Knowle the other villages have recently had developments, and the Plan covers all 3 villages for the period to 2033	
77 - The Green Belt is critical for our environment and we must protect this for future generations.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
78 - Protecting the Village character is of vital importance. Its the main reason for living in such a great location!	Noted. No action.	
83 - Yes, agree with the approach of KDBH.	Noted. No action.	
88 - We must not allow developers to make promises they will then break; ruin our 'village' and walk away with huge profits and go on to ruin somewhere else. People and their homes before profit.	Noted. Ongoing monitoring as areas are developed will be required	
89 - Support all of these. VC4 must state more strongly that existing parks are preserved. Elsewhere councils have gradually nibbled at the edges of local parks. Where new developments do take place (eg Arden triangle) new green spaces must be provided with them - at least 500 sq. m. of green space per dwelling.	Check protections on existing parks to determine if they need more protection in VC4. New green space is covered in H2, although 500sq.m./dwelling probably not feasible.	Y
93 - Its what makes the area.	Noted. No action.	
95 - I strongly agree that all the local character of Knowle and the green spaces, hedgerows etc should be protected. Once they are gone they are gone for good.	Noted. No action.	
96 - Bentley Heath Park needs to be kept and maintained. A great open space!	Noted. Check protections on existing parks. See enhanced Local Green Spaces section.	Y
97 - Maintain as much character/ green and open space as possible which is what defines the area.	Noted. No action.	
108 - Essential Policy area. It's the character of the whole location. Maintain separate identity and distinct from Solihull. No MSA at J4!	Separation from Solihull built up area is already in the Plan	
111 - I certainly want to keep the village atmosphere in Knowle but am worried that so many more people living in the area will change it considerably.	Noted. No action.	
116 - Brilliantly put.	Noted. No action.	
123 - Very concerned about proposal for land between Lodge Road / A4141 (old bypass) as currently subject to heavy flooding throughout winter. Not suitable for 20 houses. Also currently home to large range of wildlife.	Noted. The flooding risk and the effect on local wildlife are items that will have to be addressed in any development proposal for this area.	

Village Character and Natural Environment		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
126 - Preserve as much as possible.	Noted. No action.	
135 - Are the parks considered 'green space' ? They appear to be left out.	Noted. Check protections on existing parks. See enhanced Local Green Spaces section.	Y
142 - Looks all well thought out.	Noted. No action.	
145 - MIND garden needs to be protected from future development proposals - this is a vital facility for the local community. Protect and improve existing green spaces.	Noted. Future protection for Mind garden needs to be considered as part of the Arden triangle proposal. Also take up under Local Green Spaces discussion for inclusion in Local Green Spaces section.	Y
148 - Keep all Green Spaces. Protect all Green Belt.	Noted. No action.	
149 - Important to maintain existing character of each visit.	Noted. No action.	
151 - A major issue is the poor utilisation of the land around Jobs Close / car parks / village hall area of Knowle. What a great, albeit expensive, opportunity this area represents for enhancing the village.	Noted. This is included in the Community Actions in Appendix 3.	
156 - I think preservation of village character and natural environment is most important for future generations.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
158 - VC4 more green spaces to be identified eg frontages of houses on streets. VC5 especially the preservation of mature trees.	Noted. It may not be possible to define existing frontages as 'green spaces', but VC5 addresses any new development.	
160 - Green Belt should be maintained where possible. There should be park areas within any development areas, built and maintained at the developers cost.	See Policy H2	
166 - I do think we could carefully shrink St John's Close Green to allow parking at 90 degrees to the Green all round - like London but using concrete blocks with grass to retain the green effect.	Noted. Consider as part of Traffic and Transport Community Actions: Parking.	
<b>MENTIMETER</b>		
Unclear as to position regarding small areas of green belt within area - are we now likely to lose these (SMBC led)?	Noted. The purpose of the Plan is to help us shape such things in the future in KDBH	
Feel that some of statements could be beefed up a bit. Conservation aspect to be paramount ie STRONG presumption... not just presumption...	Noted	
Solihull has such a sad history in terms of "losing" historic/interesting buildings - need to protect those remaining with strong policies	Noted. No action.	
Agree with NE1 and NE2, but developers seem adept at finding ways round this..	Noted. No action.	
There are footpaths on some of the sites. We should retain the original lines as footpaths and green corridors through the sites	Noted. This has been included as an amendment to Policy H2.	Y
So very important not just for current generations but also for future generations	Noted. No action.	
Resist the Arden Triangle development - KDBH wrong-footed by Council identified sites for development. This does not have to be agreed.	Noted. The Forum continues in its opposition to the size of the Arden triangle development	
Very well thought out	Noted. No action.	
VC4 - more sites should be designated as may be threatened	Noted. Plan to be amended. Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully. However the Plan can only protect greenery in the context of new developments	Y
VC5 - protection of existing greenery needs more emphasis	Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully in Plan. Community Action Village Character 1c includes consideration of possible better use of St Johns Close area.	Y
St John's close and the area at the front of Arden school should not be classified as green space. Better use of St John close for parking	Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully in Plan	Y
Proposed green spaces map is deceptive showing a very small area of KDBH. Area in front of Arden Academy should be excluded. It's not needed	Existing rights of way covered under H2	
Some protection should be given to the walking areas in Arden triangle proposal. They are widely used by residents in accordance with 11.1.	** Part of the area at the front of Arden school has been suggested as Green Space in order to maintain this amenity close to the village centre for the benefit of the community. This is subject to ongoing discussion and Green Spaces will be defined and designated more fully in the Plan.	Y
I object very strongly to the inclusion of the green space at the front of Arden School as a Local Green Space.	See above **	Y
VC4:I strongly oppose Adren frontage being designated as Local Green Space.Outwith NPPF,unnecessary, unwarranted & -ve impact on education	See above **	Y
VC4:Would like to understand NF rationale for Arden Green Space decision.Not previously mentioned,school not notified,omitted from Sctns1-5?	Relocation or replacement of mature trees is not usually practical. The policy does not prevent developers putting forward schemes to improve an area by replacement of trees.	Y
NE1:should include provision to relocate/replace not just preserve in place.Many area could be improved by replacement rather than retention	Positive buildings are not subject to the same conditions as listed buildings.	
VC3:This policy as written is too onerous on 'positive buildings'; they should not be subject to same conditions as listed buildings.	See above **	Y
I support the Governors of Arden school that the designation of the front of Arden school as green space is restrictive and inappropriate	See above **	Y
I do NOT believe that the land at the front of Arden should be designated as Green Space.	Noted, see above **	Y
Arden Academy may require the land at front of the school to enable development plans.	Ideally more of the Green Belt would be protected, but it is a requirement that the Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies in SMBC's Local Plan	
Accept the GB needs protecting but the Forum is equally accepting the loss of high quality GB landscape eg on lansdowne and areas to south	This is ongoing.	Y
we were promised an independent landscape assessment to rank the potential land put forward for development on objective criteria	Noted, the Plan aims to strike the right balance, allowing sensitive growth to continue.	
The villages must not stagnate & be open to change provided it is sensitive.	Noted, the Plan aims to strike the right balance, allowing sensitive growth to continue.	
Too much regulation might be off putting for those wishing to invest in the area	See above **	Y
It would be better not to identify the lawn in front of Arden as a designated green space as this limits its use going forwards.	See above **	Y
It would be better not to identify the lawn in front of Arden as a designated green space as this limits its use going forwards.	See above **. If part of this area were to be designated, maintaining a similar level of Safeguarding would be required.	Y
VC4 Green Space - The land in front of Arden school should NOT be designated a public green space. This is a serious safeguarding issue!	The four examples given are major routes through the area. But the examples are stated as non-exhaustive, it is not practical to list all roads and a long list would make those not on it second-class.	
Station road and tilehouse green lane in the green streets - but longdon road is not. that is inconsistent	See above **	Y
I do not agree with the local green space designation on Station Road. The KDBH area has abundant other green spaces..	See above **	Y
I object to the grassed area outside Arden being designated as Local Green Space	Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully in Plan	Y
Generally good. I feel the green space element could protect more green spaces.	See above **	Y
I agree with most of excellent Plan, but disagree that land in front of Arden School become a 'community asset' -it should be school managed	See above **	Y
I do not support the Local Green Space in front of school being protected if it stops the school being moved and rebuilt	See above **	Y
VC4 - I disagree that the grass in front of Arden school should be green space. It shouldn't be included in the plan.	See above **	Y

Village Character and Natural Environment		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>VIA WEBSITE</b>		
With regard to green space, I am all for keeping what is presently regarded as green space, but I cannot see the area in the front of Arden school falling into that category. It is by the busy Station Road and is not an area of peace, quiet or beauty. I think to include it as such is inappropriate. 6.5	Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully in Plan	Y
Attempting to convert the grassy area at the front of Arden School into "local green space" is a new one on me! This has never been mentioned before at any stage in the process and now it's tucked away in the small print of the plan and conveniently missing from the "essential reading" section of your website. Residents will see this for what it is - an attempt to sabotage the school's Arden 2020 vision. Why are you so against something which will benefit the whole community and for windfall developments which clearly only benefit individual residents? Anyone would think you all possess large gardens! You may have shot yourselves in the foot in more ways than one - firstly, residents will see you have a hidden agenda and secondly residents will not agree to an open green space which has the potential for antisocial behaviour and traveller encampment. Tut tut!	Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully in Plan	Y
S6.5 Policy VC4- the protection of other Green Space with housing estates is critical to the Character of the area. The list is not comprehensive and should be expanded to include e.g. Copt Heath Golf Club, Purnells Way/Heathfield Close, the Streamside Trust land, the Childrens Field off Kixley Lane, Edstone Close, Milton Close etc etc;	Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully in Plan	Y
Thank you for giving me an opportunity to provide feedback on the draft neighbourhood plan for KDBH. My concern is with VC4 - the 'green spaces' visual. When I attended the exhibition at Arden Academy showcasing the draft plan, I queried the 'green spaces' visual. It appears to show only a tiny section of the neighbourhood and is therefore inaccurate. Dorrige and Bentley Heath are not represented and the section of Knowle shown seems to centre on the proposed housing area on station road. It does not show Knowle Park - a vast 'green area' right in the middle of the map, shown in white. I therefore think that this 'green spaces' map and associated comments should be omitted from the draft document as it is inaccurate, unrepresentative and misleading. It is not a reasonable representation of the KDBH neighbourhood. In addition the assertion that the entrance, car park and grass immediately in front of Arden School on Station Road, could be considered a 'green space' is ludicrous. The area you have shown is used exclusively by the School and is surely not known for it's aesthetically pleasing qualities. Surely Knowle Park, not shown, Dorrige Park, not shown and Bentley Heath Park, not shown, ought to have been included. Arden Academy site does not merit any special treatment.	Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully in Plan	Y
We are a family of 5 living in Knowle. Well done on your producing an excellent Neighbourhood Report, which must have been a huge amount of work. I imagine that you will be receiving quite a few comments from Arden School parents, but I would also like to suggest that the green area at the front of the school should not be designated as Local Green Space	See above **	Y
The second policy driver set out in the introductory paragraph to Section 6 should be amended to read "maintain and improve the village setting and feel ..." 6.1 should be amended to read "... the setting, character and feel of the villages ..." 6.7 should be amended to read "...street scene or landscape ..."	Noted. Amendments made to emphasise village setting.	Y
Subject Green space supposedly in front of the school. Message With regard to green space, I am all for keeping what is presently regarded as green space, but I cannot see the area in the front of Arden school falling into that category. It is by the busy Station Road and is not an area of peace, quiet or beauty. I think to include it as such is inappropriate. 6.5	See above **	Y
Subject Local Green Spaces (s. 6.5) .Message Attempting to convert the grassy area at the front of Arden School into "local green space" is a new one on me! This has never been mentioned before at any stage in the process and now it's tucked away in the small print of the plan and conveniently missing from the "essential reading" section of your website. Residents will see this for what it is - an attempt to sabotage the school's Arden 2020 vision. Why are you so against something which will benefit the whole community and for windfall developments which clearly only benefit individual residents? Anyone would think you all possess large gardens! You may have shot yourselves in the foot in more ways than one - firstly, residents will see you have a hidden agenda and secondly residents will not agree to an open green space which has the potential for antisocial behaviour and traveller encampment. Tut tut!	See above **. If part of this area were to be designated, it would be ensured that it did not sabotage any vision, would enhance the benefit for the whole community, and measures against antisocial behaviour and traveller encampment were as strong as at present.	Y
I hope you don't mind me contacting you, I work at Brandon Marsh as Hedgehog Officer for Warwickshire Wildlife Trust. I believe you have previously had contact and discussions with a former colleague, Simon Thompson. After becoming aware of your consultation for the Knowle, Dorrige and Bentley Heath Draft Neighbourhood Plan, I am keen to include hedgehogs in the plan. The current draft of the Solihull Local Plan outlines the "need to address the decline in biodiversity and fragmentation of habitats locally and to enhance and restore the Borough's green infrastructure". The following paragraph would align well with this regarding connectivity of green space and would hopefully help to conserve the species (and benefit other species) in the area. I would suggest including it in Section 6. "The Neighbourhood Area is situated within a Hedgehog Improvement Area and sightings of hedgehogs have been reported, notably in Knowle and Bentley Heath. Development plans will be supported when features to help the species are incorporated into new developments. Boundaries and barriers should be made permeable, for example through the use of fence panels with 13x13cm hedgehog holes at the base. Connectivity and shelter for ground-dwelling wildlife should be encouraged in the Neighbourhood Area, through features such as native species hedgerows and grassy margins. Hedgehogs have much declined in recent years and are now a priority concern for nature conservation as defined in the Warwickshire, Coventry and Solihull Local Biodiversity Action Plan. The Wildlife Trust and British Hedgehog Preservation Society have designated 'Hedgehog Improvement Areas' to help conserve this iconic species. The local community values the presence of hedgehogs and other wildlife within the neighbourhood and is keen to ensure that they are protected."	Suggested text is probably too specific. However consider inclusion of a requirement under NE2 to address the decline in biodiversity and fragmentation of habitats through ensuring barriers are permeable to wildlife such as hedgehogs and including native species hedgerows and grassy margins.	Y
As the principle of encroaching into the Green Belt for housing is already established, there is no need to build to high densities in the area. In this regard the current Taylor Wimpey development at Middlefield is unnecessarily tight and treeless and should not be repeated. Landscaping and tree planting should be a priority in all new housing areas.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	

Village Character and Natural Environment		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
As the principle of encroaching into the Green Belt for housing is already established, there is no need to build to high densities in the area. In this regard the current Taylor Wimpey development at Middlefield is unnecessarily tight and treeless and should not be repeated. Landscaping and tree planting should be a priority in all new housing areas.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
Village Character and Natural Environment I support all policies in Section 6 except 6.5 in particular land in front of Arden Academy. The area in question is not demonstrably special to the local community in general. A small part of the proposed area contains memorials to alumni and staff. These are of great significance to the school community and afforded great respect though rarely, if ever, visited or utilised by the general public. It is the firm intention of the school governors to ensure new memorials are incorporated within any future school plan. The water feature is not visible from the road nor routinely accessed by the public. Finally, the area, which directly borders Station Road (an area of concern raised in this Draft Neighbourhood Plan for "existing traffic congestion and safety") has no local significance in terms of beauty, tranquillity or richness of wildlife. I therefore contend that your designation does not meet the criteria given in paragraph 77 of the NPPF and rather the opening statement that "the Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space" is true in this case. Arden 2020, the Academy's vision to support our community and address many of the priorities identified in the Plan via a new school build. Should this new build not be possible, the Academy would need to find ways of replacing and/or renovating the oldest buildings whilst continuing to deliver a high-quality, safe and secure learning environment. This would require use of existing school land to site new and/or temporary buildings whilst renovation work was undertaken. Given the limited space available on the site, this may include the area to the front of this school. At present there are no plans to do so but as this may be the only possible way forward creating significant negative impact on learning for some 10 years I must object to the proposed designation of this land as Local Green Space as it is not "consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in ... essential services" as set out in paragraph 76 of the NPPF; education is an essential service to the community and designating this site as a Local Green Space could inhibit the Academy's ability to invest in and deliver high-quality education to its current and future pupils.	These arguments are noted and will be taken into account in the consideration of designating Local Green Spaces. It is not the intention that such a designation would frustrate any plans to improve educational facilities.	Y
I do not support the land in front of the existing Arden School being designated as a green space. It does not fit any of the criteria of a green space and will potentially be needed if the school does not get the go ahead for a new school. Also surely Knowle Park should be shown on the plan as a green space!	See above **. Green Spaces to be defined and designated more fully in Plan	Y
I actively oppose the proposal to designate land in front of Arden School as Local Green Space; I believe this is unwarranted and unnecessary and have seen no evidence that this proposal reflects a proportionate local view or request. I understand that Arden Academy has written to you in relation to this matter; I support their objection and believe that this proposal is removed. I am also concerned that this proposal was omitted from the 'essential reading' section of the NP and believe this is a fundamental oversight.	See above **	Y
One major point that we feel needs to be raised at this stage and relates to the proposal in Section 6.5 of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan: to designate land in front of the school as a Local Green Space. This is a significant proposal to our community school and it is important that we comment on this. We were unaware that this had been discussed or raised at any point during our dialogue or at community meetings. This area was not identified in either (1) the 'Summary of Residents Feedback' report (dated 30 April 2015), or (2) 'KDBH NP Residents Survey Results 2016 FINAL' Report (dated August 2016). We note that there is no mention of this proposal within the main narrative (section 1- 5) of the Draft Plan but only within the Detailed Neighbourhood Plan Policies. Since the KDBH-NF website identifies Section 1-5 as "essential reading", there is a real danger that many busy residents may take the website's guidance at face-value and therefore do not review the full policy suite. As a result they would be unaware of this proposal and its possible implications for the continued effective operation of the school. This appears to be a weakness, however unintentional, in the consultation document. Consequently, we wish to object to the inclusion of "Land at the front of Arden Academy" being designated as a Local Green Space for the reasons given below. <b>Cont. 1.</b> In the KDBH NF Residents' Survey Questionnaire[3] "Green Spaces" are defined as "...any open spaces of land that are accessible to the public. This can include: playing fields and sports pitches, wildlife areas, parks, community gardens, greens, playgrounds and cemeteries." We believe that the area of land does not fall into any of these categories. The land in question is on the school premises and should not be routinely accessed by the public for student safe-guarding reasons. We therefore contend that it falls outside your definition (above) and hence any general responses and comments made in response to Questions 57 and 58 of the questionnaire should not be taken as applying to this area of land unless they explicitly make reference to it. 2. Section 6.5 of the Plan also states that the designation of the area in front of Arden Academy as a Local Green Space is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 77 of the NPPF provides the following information on Local Green Space Designation: 77. The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used: · where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; · where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and · where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land. We believe that the area in question is not demonstrably special to the local community in general. A small part of the proposed area contains memorials to alumni and staff. These are of great significance to the school community and afforded great respect though rarely, if ever, visited or utilised by the general public. It is the firm intention of the school governors to ensure new memorials are incorporated within any future school plan. The water feature is not visible from the road nor routinely accessed by the public. Finally, the area, which directly borders Station Road (an area of concern raised in this Draft Neighbourhood Plan for "existing traffic congestion and safety") has no local significance in terms of beauty, tranquillity or richness of wildlife. We therefore contend that your designation does not meet the criteria given in paragraph 77 of the NPPF and rather the opening statement that "the Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space" is true in this case.	See box below	
	These arguments are noted and will be taken into account in the consideration of designating Local Green Spaces. It is not the intention that such a designation would frustrate any plans to improve educational facilities.	Y

Village Character and Natural Environment		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p><b>Cont.</b> Paragraph 76 of the NPPF states that:</p> <p>76. Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances. Identifying land as Local Green Space should therefore be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or reviewed, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>Earlier we made reference to Arden 2020, the Academy's vision to support our community and address many of the priorities identified in the Plan via a new school build. Should this new build not be possible, the Academy would need to find ways of replacing and/or renovating the oldest buildings whilst continuing to deliver a high-quality, safe and secure learning environment. This would require use of existing school land to accommodate new and/or temporary buildings whilst renovation work was undertaken. Given the limited space available on the site, this would likely include the area to the front of the current school. At present there are no plans to do so but as this may be the only viable way that we can continue to deliver a high-quality, safe and secure learning environment going forward we object to the proposed designation of this land as Local Green Space on the grounds that it is "consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in ... essential services" as set out in paragraph 76 of the NPPF; education is an essential service to the community and designating this site as a Local Green Space could inhibit the Academy's ability to invest in and continue to deliver high-quality education to its current and future pupils.</p> <p>In summary, we contend that the proposal to designate "Land at the front of Arden Academy" as Local Green Space has not and, because of its omission from the main body of the Draft Plan (which KDBHNF designate as Essential Reading), may not be subject to proper local consultation and, furthermore, does not meet the criteria set out in paragraphs 76 and 77 of the NPPF.</p> <p>6.2 VC1. Does anyone understand this. What permitted development rights exist where? Is this too legalistic?</p>	<p>These arguments are noted and will be taken into account in the consideration of designating Local Green Spaces. It is not the intention that such a designation would frustrate any plans to improve educational facilities.</p>	Y
<p>What are the principles set out in the Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines. (Arden)</p>	<p>This is explained further in the paragraphs under the Policy. Although it sounds legalistic it provides clear guidance to planners.</p>	
<b>VIA LIBRARY</b>		
<p>The whole area has developed its charm and attraction by creating and aintaining these characteristics. It is essential they are maintained,</p>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	
<p>Too much of or habitats (e.g. woodlands) have already been lost</p>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	
<p>There should be no developments which affect local habitats and biodiversity</p>	<p>It is inevitable that developments will affect local habitat, but the paragraph under NE2 could be enhanced.</p>	Y
<p>It is vitally important to retain character of village by retaining green spaces and protecting conservation areas. That said, where green space (such as front of Arden School) might be potential for education expansion this should be reflected in the plan to allow education and infrastruture to keep up with demand as local population grows.</p>	<p>See above **</p>	Y
<p>My main considerations concern traffic density and pollution and control of these.</p>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	
<b>SMBC</b>		
<p>1.2 From a landscape perspective the document is generally encouraging, recognising that the urban and rural landscape features of the villages contribute greatly to their character, and the Neighbourhood Plan will seek to retain, protect the existing and provide new landscape elements and green space.</p> <p>The Plan recognises the Warwickshire Landscape Guidelines: Arden and the more recent Landscape Character Assessment carried out for the latest Local Plan Review evidence base. These are documents that are used in assessing planning applications and therefore the plan is in alignment with Local Plan policies in this regard.</p> <p>Policy VC1: Green Belt and Landscape</p>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	
<p>1.3 National and local Green Belt policies are already defined in the National Planning Policy Framework and Solihull Local Plan 2013, respectively. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to include a separate policy in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>1.4 Notwithstanding this, the Council has some concerns about the policy's reference to the generic removal of permitted development rights and how this would be interpreted and applied by the decision maker. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that conditions restricting the future use of permitted development rights or changes of use will rarely pass the test of necessity and should only be used in exceptional circumstances. The scope of such conditions needs to be precisely defined, by reference to the relevant provisions in the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, so that it is clear exactly which rights have been limited or withdrawn. The blanket removal of freedoms to carry out small scale domestic alterations that would otherwise not require an application for planning permission are unlikely to meet the tests of reasonableness and necessity. The analysis of any recent appeals regarding PD rights would be beneficial.</p> <p>Policy VC3: Heritage Assets</p>	<p>VC1 has been amended to reflect this</p>	Y
<p>1.5 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not preclude development affecting local listed buildings / structures although it seeks to ensure that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. It is therefore important that applications are considered based on the degree of harm to the significance of the heritage asset. For example, depending on circumstances the partial demolition of a heritage asset may have less than substantial harm or no harm at all when removing later inappropriate additions to historic buildings which harm their significance. As it stands Policy VC3 would not provide for this scenario and would not accord with national planning policy in terms of ensuring that the harm to the significance of the heritage asset is a determining factor.</p>	<p>VC3 has been amended to reflect this</p>	Y

Village Character and Natural Environment		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p>Policy VC4: Green Space</p> <p>1.6 This policy proposes the designation of two Local Green Spaces. The first is land at St John's Close and the second is land at the front of Arden Academy. However, the NPPF states that a Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space and the designation should only be used where it meets the criteria set out in the NPPF. This includes: - Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</p> <p>- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including use as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and</p> <p>- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</p> <p>1.7 The Council does not raise any objections to either of the two 'Local Green Spaces' being designated and it would suggest that additional justification (to demonstrate its special/particular local significance) is provided in respect of the land in front of Arden Academy to ensure its inclusion is robust.</p>	<p>The list of Local Green Spaces is being further discussed with the Council and amendments made.</p>	Y
<p>Policy NE1: Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland</p> <p>1.8 The Council is supportive of this policy as it recognises the value of landscape elements / features. However, it is suggested that the policy wording / explanation makes specific reference to the document B55837 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations, as this is in line with Council requirements and will avoid any misunderstanding about the level of survey / assessment required.</p>	<p>Reference to B55837 added.</p>	Y
<p>Policy NE2: Habitats and Biodiversity</p> <p>1.9 Whilst the purpose of the policy is supported, the Council would seek clarification about how 'key local habitats and biodiversity' is being defined. Although Local Wildlife Sites are mentioned, important habitats are also found outside these sites. It is suggested that Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 which lists habitats and species of principal importance is provided as a reference for this section. Otherwise, it is unclear exactly what the requested ecological surveys should focus on.</p> <p>1.10 There is also a presumption that ecological surveys should be carried out in support of all planning applications. However, the Council would question whether this is proportionate or necessary. Notwithstanding this, in order to ensure that these surveys are of an acceptable standard and include the required information, it would be useful to refer to best practice guidance. In this instance The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) has published Guidelines for Ecological Report Writing (Dec 2017).</p>	<p>Further detail has been added to Policy NE2</p>	Y
<p><b>OFFICIAL CONSULTees</b></p>		
<p><b>Formal Representations on behalf of West Midlands Police Chief Constable.</b></p>		
<p>Policy VC3 'Heritage Assets' 15. Heritage crime, such as the theft of lead flashing, cast-iron down pipes and other historic artifacts, is a significant problem, particularly in Conservation Areas and for Listed Buildings. In an effort to reduce the incidence of recurrent heritage crime, the CCWMP request that Policy VC3 'Heritage Assets' or the supporting text, be amended to include reference to the willingness of the Neighbourhood Forum to favourably consider the use of alternative materials, where appropriate, when repairing Listed Buildings to reduce the risk of repeat theft and damage.</p> <p>16. Whilst planning permission is unlikely to be required for replacement materials, Listed Building consent is usually necessary for proposals affecting a Listed building, particularly if an alternative replacement material is proposed. It would therefore be appropriate for either an additional sentence to be included within the policy itself, or for the supporting text to make reference to the need to consider crime and safety issues in these circumstances.</p>	<p>Policy VC3 has been amended to reflect this.</p>	Y
<p><b>Cont. 17.</b> Where replacement works are proposed to Listed Buildings, it is recommended that the particular circumstances of a heritage environment, site context, and merits be considered on a case by case basis. In particular to: assess whether repeat crime (such as theft of materials from a building) is highly likely; assess the potential damage to an historic asset that may result from repeated theft of existing and any like-for-like replacement materials such as from historic churches; and, consider the significance of that particular element of the building (to be re-instated in the event of theft) in terms of its contribution to the value of that particular heritage asset. For example the lead roof on one building may not be as important to the historic asset as another due to its size, aspect or prominence on the building.</p> <p>18. There will be cases where the use of alternative materials is the most appropriate way of avoiding such crime. For instance if the site is open, has no defensible boundaries, is not subject to natural surveillance, poorly lit, and the design of the building offers offenders a number of potential routes up to the roof to target metal fixtures and fittings. This makes it difficult to install suitable measures to prevent access to the roof. Any defensive anti-climb measure, such as metal spikes, would potentially not be in keeping with the historic or architectural status of the site and would certainly not be aesthetically pleasing.</p>	<p>Continuation of above</p>	
<p><b>Cont. 19.</b> The use of replacement material (along with the installation of signage around the site indicating the material has been replaced by a 'no theft value' option) that proves valueless to any potential thief may be the most suitable measure, or an important part of a range of measures, to deter crime.</p> <p>20. The principle of this approach is accepted by English Heritage (the 3rd para in Section 3 of the document 'English Heritage Guidance Note: Theft of Metal from Church Buildings' (2011)) states: "Every case is assessed on its merits, but we appreciate that there will be instances in which a change of material will be appropriate, especially when the area of roof is not visible from ground level. After a theft, the first priority must be to provide emergency cover whilst the permanent replacement is arranged. In some situations, a durable replacement such as terne-coated stainless steel, tiles or slates, rather than lead, might be the most prudent way to repair the building".</p>	<p>Continuation of above</p>	

Village Character and Natural Environment		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p><b>Cont.</b> 21. By way of local example, at Knowle Parish Church, four metal theft offences were recorded in the 16 months prior to the stolen metal being replaced by glass reinforced plastic (GRP) in October 2012. There have been no incidents of theft or damage against the building since. Alternative metal replacement options, such as lead, cast iron and aluminium would all be attractive to thieves and as a result could draw offenders to the site.</p> <p>22. To put that lack of metal theft crime at Knowle Parish Church into context, since October 2012, issues relating to crime and anti-social behaviour continue to occur in and around the site. As recently as April 2016 a collection box was stolen from the church and there have been two vehicle offences reported immediately adjacent to the church. There have also been 14 reports of suspicious activity or anti-social behaviour in or outside the church. It is clear that the site still attracts some offenders and those undertaking anti-social behaviour, and therefore the threat against the church remains.</p> <p>23. The CCWMP recommends introduction of the following wording: · 'In appropriate circumstances, favourable consideration will be given to the use of approved 'alternative' materials to replace building materials and artefacts stolen from buildings of historic importance to reduce crime and the fear of crime'.</p>	Continuation of above.	Y
<p><b>Environment Agency Flood Risk:</b> The Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) should propose local policies to safeguard land at risk from fluvial flooding and the provision of sustainable management of surface water from both allocated and future windfall sites. The local policies should seek to enhance the policies in Solihull Metropolitan Borough Councils adopted Local Plan 2013 – 2028 and Solihull Metropolitan Borough Councils emerging Draft Local Plan up to 2033.</p> <p>We have reviewed the Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath Draft NDP 2018 – 2033, Pre-Submission Consultation, November 2017 and the NDP does not propose any policies to safeguard land at risk of flooding from the allocated sites or any future windfall sites. The NDP should identify what mitigation measures it considers necessary e.g. safeguarding specific land (after identification) for flood attenuation or natural flood risk management, and include this in the policies, to ensure that sites are safe and will not increase flood risk elsewhere and that opportunities to reduce flood risk are identified.</p> <p>We recommend that flood risk management policies are included in the NDP to cover these aspects and take into account the impacts of climate change. This should support the strategic development needs as set out in Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council's Local Plan. In particular with regard to Policy P5 – Provision of Land for Housing, Policy P9 – Climate Change and Policy P11 – Water Management of the Local Plan.</p>	&& We believe that Flood Risk Management is more appropriately addressed by the Local Plan Policies, and there is no benefit in duplicating them here.	
<p><b>Cont.</b> The River Blythe and Purnells Brook, both classified as Main Rivers, flows through the Knowle, Dorridge, Bentley Heath Plan area. These watercourses should be shown within the NDP as they are major features and there may be potential opportunities to protect and enhance the river corridors and reduce flood risk in the area. Other watercourses within the Plan area should also be considered in the NDP, such as the watercourse, designated an Ordinary Watercourse, along the South Eastern boundary of the area.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to the following measures to protect and enhance the river corridors of the River Blythe, Purnells Brook and Ordinary Watercourses located in the NDP area. This should consider the inclusion of the following mitigation measures;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Ensuring all new development is in Flood Zone 1. Only if there is no viable/available land in Flood Zone 1 should other areas be considered using the Sequential Test approach. Please note that any watercourse which does not have any flood extents associated with it, such as Purnells Brook, will require further work or modelling as part of detailed planning applications to ensure the development will be safe and not increase flood risk.</li> <li>· All developments should create space for water by restoring floodplains and contributing towards Blue and Green Infrastructure.</li> <li>· Allocated sites should be highlighted and the flood risk associated with them identified.</li> <li>· Opportunities to reduce flood risk elsewhere by allocating flood storage areas.</li> <li>· Setting back development 8m from the watercourses to allow access for maintenance and restoring the natural floodplain. This includes existing culverted watercourses.</li> <li>· Ensure all SuDs features are located outside of the 1 in 100 year plus climate change flood extent.</li> <li>· Open up culverted watercourses and remove unnecessary obstructions.</li> </ul>	See above &&	
<p><b>Cont.</b> In addition to the above, all developments should seek to control and discharge all surface water runoff generated on site during the 1 in 100 year plus climate change rainfall event. For Greenfield development sites, the surface water runoff generated as a result of the development should not exceed the Greenfield runoff rate. For Brownfield development sites, developers are expected to deliver a substantial reduction in the existing runoff rate, and where possible, reduce the runoff to the equivalent Greenfield rate.</p> <p>We recommend that Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) are consulted on this Plan. The LLFA are responsible for managing flood risk from local sources including ordinary watercourses, groundwater and surface water.</p> <p>We have recently updated our guidance for Neighbourhood Planning Groups on the gov.uk website: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/consulting-on-neighbourhood-plans-and-development-orders">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/consulting-on-neighbourhood-plans-and-development-orders</a>.</p>	See above &&	

Village Character and Natural Environment		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p><b>Cont.</b> Groundwater and Contaminated Land: Please note these comments relate solely to the protection of 'Controlled Waters'. Reference to the 1:50,000 scale geological map indicates that the area designated in the draft neighbourhood plan is mostly located on the bedrock of the Triassic Mercia Mudstone which is designated a 'Secondary (B) Aquifer' by the Environment Agency. Part of the area towards the centre of the neighbourhood plan area is located on the Arden Sandstone Formation, which is designated as a Secondary A Aquifer. This strata is covered by various superficial deposits of sands &amp; gravels and clays which are designated as 'Secondary (A) Aquifers' and 'Secondary Undifferentiated Aquifers' respectively. Secondary A Aquifers are capable of supporting water supplies at a local rather than strategic scale, and in some cases forming an important source of base flow to rivers. Secondary B and Undifferentiated Aquifers may store and yield limited amounts of groundwater due to localised features such as fissures, thin permeable horizons. There are no Source Protection Zones identified in the Neighbourhood Plan area. Several surface water features are identified for the plan area, including the River Blythe and the Cuttle Brook, which forms the south-eastern boundary of the area. Our records indicate that a historic landfill is located within the central area of the neighbourhood plan area, identified as 'Knowle Brickworks'. This is noted to have accepted builders waste up until 1973 and was not licensed. A second historic landfill is noted for the northern most part of the proposed plan area, identified as 'Jacobean Lane', at Copt Heath. This is noted to have accepted excess motorway construction materials. It should be noted that Local Authorities hold the most detailed records of historic landfills and consequently the relevant department of Solihull MBC be contacted to ascertain if there is any additional information available.</p>	See above &&	
<p><b>Cont.</b> If development is to be carried out in the areas of the former landfills, consideration should be given to any residual risk to 'Controlled Waters' receptors and the need for any remedial actions. In planning any development in this neighbourhood plan area, reference should be made to our 'Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice' (GP3) document. This sets out our position on a wide range of activities and developments, including: · Storage of pollutants and hazardous substances · Solid waste management · Discharge of liquid effluents into the ground (including site drainage) · Management of groundwater resources · Land contamination · Ground source heat pumps · Cemetery developments Government Policy, as detailed in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 120), states that 'where a site is affected by contamination or land stability issues, responsibility for securing a safe development rests with the developer and/or landowner'. Consequently should a development site currently or formerly have been subject to land-use(s) which have the potential to have caused contamination of the underlying soils and groundwater then any Planning Application must be supported by a Preliminary Risk Assessment. This should demonstrate that the risks posed to 'Controlled Waters' by any contamination are understood by the applicant and can be safely managed.</p>	See above &&	
<p><b>Cont.</b> Biodiversity: There's no acknowledgement of the Blythe SSSI running through the west of the NDP area. This site should be acknowledged in the NDP possibly within 4.5 Protect Green Space and the Environment. Specific regard could also be given in Policy NE2, Section 6.8. Environmental protection and enhancement cannot be achieved without the understanding and support of local communities. The river restoration strategy for the river Blythe SSSI will rely on the involvement of local communities to make progress and achieve sustained outcomes in line with the catchment based approach. Appendix 3 Community Actions - Village Character and the Natural Environment could make reference to the role the local community has in the success of the restoration strategy. Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2033 Thank you for your consultation on the above dated and received by <b>Natural England</b> on 29th November 2017. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made. Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.</p>	If specific Community Actions are identified relating to the Blythe Valley SSSI these will be added to the ongoing list of Community Actions in the future	
<p><b>THE KNOWLE SOCIETY.</b> Consequently, and noting the comment included in the draft Neighbourhood Plan (NP) under Policy VC2 on page 18, it is suggested therefore, that although the proposed Policies within the document, ie 1. VC2 – Conservation Areas, 2. VC3 – Heritage Assets, and 3. D2 – Design in Conservation Areas they do not go far enough to ensure a sustainable resistance is available to inappropriate development or redevelopment. Consequently it is requested that further consideration be given to achieving full Policy status for the recommendations made in the CAA rather than being left, as suggested in the draft NP, as Community Actions.</p>	Noted. No action.	
	Noted. The requirement for development proposals to have regard to the Knowle Conservation Area Appraisal 2007 has been added to Policy D2. Most points are covered in NP. Those in the CAs are not land use eg review of listings and so are appropriately placed in the CAs.	Y

Village Character and Natural Environment		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>Policy Showcase launch of Neighbourhood Plan Consultation</b>		
<p>The areas mentioned on post-it notes placed on the board for suggested Local Green Spaces, with the number of times each area was suggested.</p> <p>MIND Garden - 9</p> <p>Bentley Heath Park (and allotments) - 7</p> <p>Knowle Park - 4</p> <p>Dorridge Park - 2</p> <p>Hanbury Park - 2</p> <p>Conker Lane - 6</p> <p>Green route from Four Ashes (by D&amp;M) to Conker Lane and Railway - 1</p> <p>The Ards, Dorridge Rd - 2</p> <p>Knowle Locks - 2</p> <p>Copse at Dorridge Rd / Avenue Rd corner (opposite station) - 3</p> <p>Former bypass route from Longdon Rd to Warwick Rd - 4</p> <p>Green island in Edstone Close - 2</p> <p>Green island in Hanbury Rd - 2</p> <p>St Johns Close - 1</p> <p>Knowle Children's Field, Kixley Lane (vested in National Trust) - 1</p> <p>Field at corner of Widney Rd / Browns Lane - 1</p> <p>Land at end of Moorfield Avenue (Pool End) - 1</p> <p>Bullivents Coppice, Bentley Heath - 1</p> <p>New space within new housing developments (Pollution reduction, Safe play areas) -1</p>	<p>These areas have been considered as part of the Local Green Spaces study, and the Local Green Spaces section has been amended</p>	<p>Y</p>

Housing		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE AT LAUNCH OF DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 25/11/17</b>		
2 - All housing should be of good/high quality . Insulation for reduced bills and solar / renewable sources should be encouraged not sidelined.	Agreed, Covered by Policies P15 and P9 of the SLP and Draft SLP. No action required.	
4 - ('5' ratings given) subject to comments. H4 can we add a policy to say room sizes should be in keeping with existing stock larger than 12m <sup>2</sup> double bedroom, 9m <sup>2</sup> single bedroom, 16m <sup>2</sup> lounge, 9m <sup>2</sup> kitchens, 6m <sup>2</sup> bathrooms. H5 Gardens should be greater than [3x] than footprint of a house, maisonette / apartment (with gardens). Garden > 3 x 2 bed area, garden > 4 x 3 bed area, garden > 5 x 4 bed area, garden > 6 x 5 bed area. In keeping with immediate proximity (<100m).	Too prescriptive	
5 - H1 Strongly support your objection to Draft Local Plan. H2 recent developments are too small and dangerous for pedestrians must have pavements and off street parking. 3 storey buildings are at the top of the site - meaning they overlook everyone - this is to be avoided. H3 Make it pleasant and not cramped - no fair to have sub-standard. H4 Downsize don't want tiny rooms. H5 No more 5 or 6 bedroom houses - enough already. H7 What constitutes "material harm to living conditions"?	H1 to H4 agreed. Covered in NP. No action required. H5 Under review. H7 Matter for the decision taker ie the Council but NF and residents can make objections to individual planning applications.	
6 - When housing development is undertaken policies must be put in place on disruption. Even extension on Station Road causes traffic issues what would a major development cause.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
7 - H1 to H6 All these aspects need to be designed carefully, but we do need to have more houses. H7 & H8 These need to be more closely monitored.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
12 - 540 is the max number of new houses. H5 Tie down the phrase "All schemes to pay particular regard to the character and appearance of where they are located". Pay particular regard and ensure that no adverse impact ?	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. No need to change wording in H5 (although amended for other reasons).	
23 - Concerned about new Arden School entrance onto Stripes Hill. At present too many 4/5/6 bed houses being built by small developers. No affordable housing. Agree 500 new houses preferable to 1000.	Noted.	
27 - Not rapid building of large plots of housing.	Noted. Address through Draft Local Plan and Concept Masterplan representations. No action re. NP.	
28 - I am strongly against the proposed size of development on green belt land.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
31 - We need housing - but it should be on brown site - not green belt. Social housing for locals.	We need housing - but it should be on brown site - not green belt. . Noted. Maintain objections to Draft Local Plan. No action re. NP. Social housing for locals. Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	
32 - If houses to have Mult Car Parking Place this take up a lot of space that could be used for affordable housing for young people.	Noted.	
33 - Use brown fill first.	Noted. Address through Draft Local Plan and Concept Masterplan representations. No action re. NP.	
37 - 500 houses (440-540) dwellings are local need. Why are Knowle building any more? This should be reduced! H2 Low density development preferred. H3 Is this practical? H5 How do KDBH NF propose to control market forces? Is this realistic?	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
41 - Very Knowle focussed. Affordable housing is important provision. Too much NIMBYism - need to promote a more open minded approach. Rented housing and sales so we don't sideline the younger generations' ability to live where they grew up.	We need housing - but it should be on brown site - not green belt. . Noted. Maintain objections to Draft Local Plan. No action re. NP. Social housing for locals. Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	
42 - I would prefer to see more two bedroom houses than three, four and five. I think the need is greater for starter homes and for people who want to downsize.	Policies H4 and H5 amended.	Y
45 - H1 Too many houses proposed. H4 Space around - not crammed in.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need. H4 Space around - not crammed in. Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required	
47 - Don't agree with social housing being provided and being filled with problem tenants. Need to have a contractual agreement with tenants to enable easy eviction.	NP must be in general conformity with Local Plan. No action.	
48 - The scale of housing will pose problems for the character and infrastructure of the area. Land is standing empty on the site of the old Wyevale (Eastcote) garden centre. This could be the nucleus for a new village which would be closer to the station at Hampton and new developments linked to H52 etc.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
49 - Set a figure for maximum housing density.	NP must be in general conformity with Local Plan. No action.	
55 - 50% detached is too high for current housing needs - greater proportion of semis. More 2 bed houses - need young people in the 'town'. Exclusivity clauses regarding 5-year residence before access to certain housing is unnecessary. We'll all be inbred before we know it! We need fresh blood into the area. If this is designed to keep out 'undesirables' I think the inevitable high prices will go some way to fo that - not that all richer people are 'desireables'.	50% detached is too high for current housing needs - greater proportion of semis. More 2 bed houses - need young people in the 'town'. Policies H4 and H5 amended. Exclusivity clauses regarding 5-year residence before access to certain housing is unnecessary. We'll all be inbred before we know it! We need fresh blood into the area. If this is designed to keep out 'undesirables' I think the inevitable high prices will go some way to fo that - not that all richer people are 'desireables'. Policy responds to strong local representations for priority to be given to those with a local connection.	Y
58 - Ensure that the Green Belt is kept now and in the future.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
61 - Consider innovative approaches to affordable housing provision eg. leading edge technology / re-using commercial buildings.	Noted. Discuss with Council. No action re. NP.	
62 - H2 Please ensure current householders on periphery of Arden Triangle eg Milverton are respected by putting 3 storey buildings in the centre. H3 Teachers for local schools. Local doctors / nurses for hospitals won't have had ability to live here for 5 years but would need less expensive housing. H4 More 2 bed houses younger people to live locally - eg carers / divorcees.	H2 Noted. Address through Draft Local Plan and Concept Masterplan representations. No action re. NP. H3 Noted. H4 and H5 amended.	Y
64 - H3 Affordable housing should be for people with a local connection, not overspill from other councils.	Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	
65 - New housing will undoubtedly affect Station Road from the present Arden School site. What can be done to help alleviate congestion.	Noted. Address through Draft Local Plan and Concept Masterplan representations. No action re. NP.	
66 - Any future development needs to be in keeping with existing properties and infrastructure. In other words it should enhance the community and not devalue it.	Agreed, Covered in NP. No action required.	
67 - Appreciate new housing is needed but 750 houses on Arden triangle too much number needs reducing. Impact on character of village, infrastructure, roads / facilities - already experiencing grid lock on roads coming up Stripes Hill into Knowle on regular basis.	Agreed. Maintain objections to Draft Local Plan. No action re. NP.	
71 - The plans proposed to scale back the development to 500 houses is a very important step, helping retain the village character and manage the transport. Why is there no suggestion of development elsewhere eg Dorridge and Bentley Heath. Need provision of smaller, lower cost units for young people less large detached housing.	Agreed. Covered in NP. Location of development not addressed in NP. No action required. Need provision of smaller, lower cost units for young people less large detached housing. H4 and H5 amended.	Y
73 - H1 The current infrastructure and all facilities do not support this level of development.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	

<b>Housing</b>		<b>Action Taken</b>
<b>Source / Comment</b>	<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	
74 - H1 Current infrastructure does not support the scale of the proposed new housing.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
75 - 500 is reasonable but not the council plan for 1050. Not the Wychwood housing site. It would be better to build near the Gate Lane motorway junction. There is plenty of land there, better access to the motorway and it would not affect Knowle/Dorridge and cause lots of extra traffic.	Noted. The NP does not seek to deal with the suitability or unsuitability of particular sites.	
77 - Scale of new housing must be reduced. Still believe we should use the land near the motorway though, particularly as most of the traffic will be headed that way.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
78 - No Development at Wychwood Roundabout. I think we should keep the 'Gap' in case a bypass becomes a necessity (not a nice to have!). I don't think the current road infrastructure can cope with another 1000 homes.	Noted. NP does not allocate sites. Matter for representations to Draft Local Plan. No action re NP.	
79 - Do not need more houses, population crisis not housing crisis.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
81 - 500 houses is sufficient not 1050! Why not use other land closer to the M42?	Location of large scale housing development not addressed in NP. No action required.	
82 - Needs affordable small housing - not 4/5 bedroom properties. Need for first time buyers/renters who are local and older people who are local to downsize to ?? sheltered housing.	Affordable housing will be smaller house types. No action required	
83 - Agree. the development of Knowle Academy should be resisted being too large and out of character. How does that development link to employment areas? Traffic ??? needed.	Noted. Maintain objections to Draft Local Plan. No action re. NP	
84 - Parking relative to house size critical. 10% 5 bedroom too high.	T1 amended	Y
85 - Developers providing adequate parking for new housing. 10% would seem quite a high percentage for 5 bedroom houses.	T1 amended	Y
88 - The proposed 750 houses on the Arden Triangle is outrageous and no matter what practical infrastructure measures are implemented, this density of houses will have a devastating effect on the whole of Knowle. 500 houses on this site is more realistic and acceptable but still too many. H8 consideration for neighbours.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need. H8 consideration for neighbours. Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	
90 - H8 Consider design ie. for neighbouring properties.	Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	
91 - I do not see the need for such large developments as we do not have the infrastructure to cope with this.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need. Location of large scale housing development not addressed in NP. No action.	
92 - H8 If designs are considerate and do not infringe on neighbours.	Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	
97 - Your hands are tied!	Noted	
98 - No conversion of residential property to commercial.	Noted. Working from home is encouraged subject to appropriate tests.	
99 - Strongly against the size of the development of the Arden Triangle and believe this to be a classic stitch up. Whilst in favour of the school redevelopment experience tells me it will be an utter disaster given Arden Academy's experience.	Noted. Maintain objection to Draft Local Plan. No action re. NP.	
105 - Market housing - the allocation for bungalows should be increased from 7% to 15%. It would be reasonable for a larger proportion of the housing to be at Dorridge rather than Knowle. It would then be nearer to the station. Maybe then more car parking spaces would be provided in Dorridge by the developers.	Market housing - the allocation for bungalows should be increased from 7% to 15%. H4 and H5 amended. It would be reasonable for a larger proportion of the housing to be at Dorridge rather than Knowle. It would then be nearer to the station. Maybe then more car parking spaces would be provided in Dorridge by the developers. Noted. The NP does not allocate sites for housing. No action re NP.	Y
107 - Affordable Housing proposals for 'local connection' spot on! A fair compromise.	No action.	
108 - I rather think that whether we like it or not, the only option being offered by SMBC will go forward regardless. The only option for KDBH is how to influence and mitigate the impact of these proposals.	The NP seeks to do this. No action required.	
109 - Even more small / affordable please. Less detached please. More 2 bedroom.	Under review.	Y
111 - There is already traffic jams at peak times down Station Road. To build over 1000 homes would cause chaos! I think more bungalows should be built for our aging population. Any new houses must have drives for parking and NOT road parking as in Dickens Heath.	H4 and H5 amended. Any new houses must have drives for parking and NOT road parking as in Dickens Heath. Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	Y
112 - Scale of development should be restricted in order to maintain the character of the villages. Note how Sainsburys has effected the traffic and maners of the area.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
116 - Re apartments, what worries me is the cost. If we sold our large and developed 3 bedroom semi with lovely garden, we would not be able to afford a small 2 bedroom apartment for our older years if we couldn't manage our home. That's all wrong. Agree that we need more shared ownership affordable housing in relation to social rented. Feel that the percentages are wrong for H5. 10% 2 bedroom is too low. Need more smaller starter sizes and fewer 5 bedrooms - we have too many houses for the rich already.	H4 and H5 amended. Any new houses must have drives for parking and NOT road parking as in Dickens Heath. Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	Y
123 - Too much 500 houses just in Knowle puts a lot of pressure on High St. Please reduce number and consider locating some in Dorridge / Bentley Heath. This plan is meant to include all three areas. More variation in house types - affordable housing not just worth over £750,000.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need. Location of large scale housing development not addressed in NP. No action. More variation in house types - affordable housing not just worth over £750,000. H4 and H5 amended.	Y
125 - Important to provide new provision of housing, but limited to around 400-500. To be spread evenly among Knowle, Dorridge, and Bentley Heath. Mixture of affordable is important to allow younger generation onto the market.	Location of large scale housing development not addressed in NP. No action. Raise dispersal point with Council in draft local Plan representations.	
126 - Why such dense sites?	NP policies seek to reduce densities on new developments. No action.	
135 - It would be disappointing if the Neighbourhood Plan is not in conformity with the new Local Plan, as the Solihull plan would take precedence - therefore making the N Plan either out of date or obsolete.	Agreed. The Council have been consulted to ensure it is in general conformity. No action required	
137 - Knowle already becomes virtually gridlocked around 17.00 on weekdays - Station Road junction with Warwick Road - traffic on Warwick Road backs up beyond Wychwood roundabout.	Noted. Maintain objections to Draft Local Plan. No action re NP.	
142 - I'm currently in rented housing as single person, and would love to move to better quality rented housing or affordable starter home. This is key issue for people in 20s and 30s being able to live in this area - I would love to stay in Dorridge.	Note. No action required.	
145 - Number, size, quality and design of new housing must be in keeping with local area : ie. good mix of housing and low density. The impact of high number of new housing on local infrastructure must be assessed - particularly impact on road traffic as this will be the most significant aspect of large numbers of houses that will have a significant impact on all local residents.	Agreed. Address through Draft Local Plan and Concept Masterplan representations. No action re. NP.	Y

<b>Housing</b>		<b>Action Taken</b>
<b>Source / Comment</b>	<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	
148 - No more houses. None at all.	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
149 - The possible concentration of most 'new build' in two main areas is unacceptable. Much better to have a larger number of small / medium developments to spread density and strain on roads etc.	Location of large scale housing development not addressed in NP. No action. Raise dispersal point with Council in Draft Local Plan representations	
153 - Why this amount of housing to be put here? There are thousands of brownfield sites unused - unloved - why not make new villages instead of ruining existing ones? If it must go ahead I agree to proposals!	Noted. NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meet local housing need.	
155 - Knowle already has more than enough of 5+ bedroom house. A lot more 2-3 bedroom houses are needed for the young people who in time will move into much larger house vacated by the elderly!	H5 amended.	Y
156 - New housing when needed should re-use vacated used sites as a result of changes caused by new technologie ie shops and offices.	Noted. Policies seek to maintain the economic vibrancy of the commercial centres. No action.	
157 - Lower cost Housing. People extend what they buy. Reduce detached in future plans. More small houses / bungalows.	H4 and H5 amended	Y
158 - Definitely agree that KDBH plan echoes local fears about the community being unable to absorb the proposed volume. An alternative is a new village eg between Hampton and Knowle, or between Hockley Heath and Dorridge ie on green fields.	Noted. A matter for Draft Local Plan representations. No action re NP.	
160 - Housing density should be aligned to the existing density of K/D. Possibly a higher proportion of apartments or family 'starter' homes to attract (or retain) some 20-30 yr olds.	Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	
161 - Strongly agree about need for affordable housing but need stronger action to prevent builders wriggling out of their commitments to affordable housing.	Noted. Refer to Council. No action re. NP.	
162 - H2 any development should aim to 'improve' existing infrastructure issues. H7 OK but Wychwood roundabout site must take into consideration the need for access to the entire length of Purnells Brook for regular pruning / clearing in order to prevent flooding to houses in Longdon Road.	Noted. No action re. NP.	
163 - Scale should reflect existing density of housing.	Agreed. Covered in NP. No action required.	
164 - H4 Larger proportion of bungalows needed. H5 No need for 5 bedroom houses as families are getting smaller.	H4 and H5 amended.	Y
<b>MENTIMETER</b>		
H3: but what does "first to be offered to" mean? Cd then be offered to those with no connection to KDBH? Poss social/transport etc issues	Gives priority to those with a local connection.	
H5: don't agree with need for 5+ bdrm houses! Plenty already and often built as result of windfall devt anyway (in Dorridge)	H4 and H5 amended	Y
H5: Surely need for higher % of 2 bdrm houses (though note that flats and bungalows not inc). Gd qual 2 bdrm with gardens for older res.	H4 and H5 amended.	Y
H7: Dev't of windfall sites (eg demolish old house and build 2+ new homes) can seriously affect character of road/area. Continues ...	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
H7: ...from spacious, green, historically/architect interesting props to bland and/or ostentatious houses (eg in Dorridge golden triangle)	Noted	
H7: but can also see that occasionally works if built up area anyway and just filling in behind existing. doesn't sig address housing needs.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
I am not entirely supportive of a policy which restricts access to housing in KDBH only to people who have live here already.	Noted. Is a preference policy, not complete restriction on access.	
There should be a strong presumption against the conversion of houses to commercial use eg dentist, doctors and offices	Such uses would require planning permission. Assess on their merits.	
Not Support. Housing of 500 is still far too much for this area. Develop brownfield sites in other areas of West Midlands that want it.	Noted.NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meeting housing needs. Policy text amended.	Y
Even if Council agrees at 500 houses will be thin end of wedge. Also ad hoc houses will get the number up to over 1,000 houses.	Noted.NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meeting housing needs. Policy text amended..	Y
Residents only agree to housing to get a new school and community benefits. If developers cannot guarantee this then reject altogether.	Noted.NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meeting housing needs. Policy text amended.	Y
How can developers provide £30m for new school as per M Murphy - on 500 homes equates to £60k per house - will never happen. Do the maths.	Noted. Matter for Local Plan.	Y
I support the policy that people with strong local connections are allocated affordable housing.	Noted. No action.	
I don't support the bias against social rented affordable housing.	Noted. Neighbourhood Plan reflects prevailing view but ultimately determined by Solihull MBC Local Plan policy. No action.	
Policy H5 - we do not need more houses with 5 or more bedrooms.	H5 amended	
Downsizing does not mean moving into a shoe box!		Y
The 500 new houses suggested is proportionate and more in touch with the needs of the area. Also support provision of affordable houses.	Noted. No action.	
There is little point proposing a housing target that is not aligned with the emerging Solihull Local Plan. This figure should be removed	Noted. SLP is still at early stage. Proposed scale reflects evidence base. Policy recognises final figure will reflect outcome of SLP Review.	
I do not support the policy statement is is clear an addition 700/800 houses are required.	The proposed 500 excludes windfalls which will significantly increase total numbers.	
Do not support the houses should be restricted to those who work in Solihull area rather	Noted.NP needs to make proportionate contribution to meeting housing needs. Policy text amended.	Y
Need to have higher proportion of 3 bed houses.	H5 amended.	Y
500 dwellings + windfalls is a more reasonable scale of development to that proposed by the Council	Noted. No action.	
The area is in many ways (e.g. car parking/ traffic levels/pressure on services) already becoming 'over-developed'	Noted. No action.	
There is a great danger of development breaking into sensitive landscape areas damaging the rural setting of Knowle.	Noted. NP policies seek to protect landscape and rural setting. Maintain objections to scale of housing through Local Plan Review.	
Housing %age too skewed towards higher end. In the order of 15% 2 and 50% 3 beds to support other policy goals seems more balanced	H5 amended.	Y
Too much emphasis on 'apartments for older people'.We have a high &age of these already;vibrancy of village demands range of ages	H5 amended.	Y
Affordable housing policy feels like social engineering,the village should welcome & would benefit from new residents. Relax this section	Noted. Neighbourhood Plan reflects prevailing view but ultimately determined by Solihull MBC Local Plan policy. No action.	
House types only addressee needs of older people.Far too focused on these needs. I strongly oppose this section; it skews the entire NP	NP policies seek to address house needs across all groups, young families and elderly. No action.	
It is not right to dictate housing mix.		
The quantum of older peoples housing looks woefully low .	H4 and H5 amended.	
2 'dementia' homes...how big? Who says?		Y
The Res. Survey gave views on the various sites proposed at the Dev. Showcase. The NP should reflect these priorities in its policies.	NP does not allocate sites.	
New build house size reflects current NOT FUTURE needs. Proposed 10% 2 bed homes too few for downsize, marriage break up, young people,etc	H4 and H5 amended.	Y
45% allocation to 4 & 5 bed homes will stagnate area locking older people into keeping their larger homes as no alternative accommodation	H5 amended.	Y
Accommodation should be allocated for care givers, health professionals & those who support the community - 2 bedroomed properties?	Noted but Council Affordable Housing policy is not key worker based.	

<b>Housing</b>		<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
<b>Source / Comment</b>			
Housing build density crucial. Give examples of best practice as a way forward eg Hertford Way, Woodside Crescent & Grove Road in front of area 5 Middlefield is example of good mixed development 4 bed, 2 bed & retirement apartments with retained mature trees.	Agree future density important to village character. Already covered in NP.		
Housing DENSITY in this wider Middlefield /Grove Road area could be a template for future development	Comments re mix noted but Middlefield has also attracted much adverse comment re design and lack of greenery.		
I would prefer to see the Winchwood Road site used for much needed out of town parking rather than housing for which there is resistance.	Unclear. Middlefield density is substantially higher than Grove Rd area.		
More smaller houses are needed for younger and older people. The level of housing to be provided also seems to be low given regional needs.	Wychwood? Assume refers to former by pass land where Council has assumed some housing development. Not convinced of suitability for parking if intended to serve the village centres.		
The area is losing all sense of identity and is just becoming one large suburban sprawl. I see no benefit for local people whatsoever.	H4 and H5 amended. Scale of housing reflects NP evidence base but final number will be determined through LPR process.		Y
H1-Add-Up to 500 houses & flats.	Noted. NP aims to improve new development to maintain character.		
H2-Add-Sufficient Off Road parking to keep the roads free.	H1- stating "up to" in policy has been rejected by Inspectors so needs to be "about". H2 points noted, covered by safety requirements and Council play requirements.		
-Add-close by play area for younger children			
H3 - Add - Will not exceed national levels of pollution.	H3 satisfactorily covers air pollution.		
On H5 I think that more should be done to create more smaller 2 and 3 bed homes as the percentage of homes with 4 and 5 beds is too high.	H5 amended.		Y
Too many green field sites being used and too many in-fill sites.	NP does not allocate sites. Maintain NF objections to Local Plan Review on scale of housing.		
you need majority of 2-3 bed houses so that people can downsize and therefore create the 4 bedroom housing that is already built and exists.	H5 amended.		Y
I am concerned what the total figure of housing is ,especially in the land swop. Will it just be the 500 stated.	The figure refers to about 500 on allocated sites excluding windfalls.		
H1: Should be less than proposed 500 units. If this is the "demand" side proposal, residents should aim to restrict, as well as supply side	About 500 is the "unconstrained " figure and is subject to capacity testing. Text clarified.		Y
<b>VIA WEBSITE</b>			
The explanatory notes on S7.3 could include cycle storage;	Agreed. Amend plan.		Y
The 'Application' of S7.3 to sites of 20 or more houses includes the site off the Wychwood Roundabout. This site has been offered for 'up to' 20 houses, so could easily be taken out of consideration by reducing it to 19. I suggest using a cut-off of 15;	15 considered to be too onerous as policy. However, point is noted and NF will press for pre application consultation on this site given sensitivities of Purnells Brook, wildlife and amenity corridor and relationship to existing houses.		
S7.3 – where Rights of Way are affected by construction, they should be retained as green routes (e.g. Conker Lane), not diverted via pavements or footways. There is a certain confusion in the use of the terms 'foot ways' and 'footpaths' as well as 'Rightsof Way' in the document;	Agreed. Amend plan.		Y
The second policy driver set out in the introductory paragraph to Section 7 should be amended to read "... in terms of built form, landscape and ..." and the final policy driver amended to read "to safeguard or enhance the quality of the built environment, its setting and the landscape of the area" 7.2 The Principles and commentary on Policy Development set out above and the policy directions set out below should guide the interplay between the development of Local and Neighbourhood Plan development and so the provisions of Policy H1. 7.3 The bullet points of Policy H2 should be amended to read: * landscape setting and the nature of the edge of built development where it meets the countryside, * the impact of development on the setting of historic settlements, townscapes, landscapes and buildings, * the integration of new & existing development visually and through good physical connectivity, * the scale, density and form of built development and its relationship to local townscapes and vernacular, * off site traffic & transportation impacts including impacts on air quality and the conservation, & enjoyment of the historic & natural environment (also applicable to Policy T5), * impacts on flood risk and the application of sustainable drainage principles * etc... with the accompanying text reviewed accordingly.	Some points acceptable to strengthen landscape considerations, some points already covered. Some amendments made.		Y
I would like to ADD further input on the DRAFT neighbourhood plan, in light of the most recent RESIDENTS information that I have read;			
1. There was clear feedback from the Residents Survey in 06/16 that 98% of respondents (out of 2481) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of 500+ houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the Triangle is c.750.			
2. At the Developer Showcase event in 07/16 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list			
3. The Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.			
4. There were 11 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt. I personally agree with the results of the RESIDENTS survey, that the land around Grove Road should remain as GREEN BELT and that the 11 'most supported' alternative sites have significant capacity to more than compensate (if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt).			
There are other benefits to this more dispersed sites approach, as some of the alternative locations are more sustainable in transport accessibility, and better located to the A3400 / M42, which is also means the houses will be closer to the employment area of Blythe Valley .			
I hope that the Forum can therefore adopt the views of the RESIDENTS in the proposed DRAFT plan	The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.		

Housing		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p>I wish to oppose the development of the Arden Triangle within the KDBH Neighbourhood Draft Plan. The existing infrastructure of Knowle and Dorridge is bursting at the seams, the local school nursery, infant and junior departments are already oversubscribed and existing children in the area have to go on waiting lists for a school place. Dr's surgeries are full to their capacities. Car parks already at maximum capacity and the main roads around the area already very busy. The proposed increase in the population by building on Green Belt in the Arden Triangle, Grove Road (North side) would change the existing 'village' environment and lead to congestion throughout a small area.</p> <p>I attach a document - the contents of the document represent concerns expressed in a number of conversations with residents of Knowle which have been translated into formal representations with the help of a professional planning colleague.</p> <p>Also I would like to add that the point to the Forum that whilst the housing allocations still have yet to be finalised by SMBC in their next draft, there was clear feedback from the Residents Survey in June 2016 that 98% of respondents (out of 2481) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of 500+ houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the Triangle is c.750.</p> <p>At the Developer Showcase event in July 2016 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list but the Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.</p> <p>There were 11 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt.</p> <p>There are other benefits to this more dispersed sites approach as some of the alternative locations are more sustainable in transport accessibility, it would increase competition amongst developers and give variety of design and house types and finally improve the pace of overall development instead of waiting for Taylor Wimpey or similar to roll out 50-60 houses a year as they have at Middlefield.</p> <p>I do not see where this evidence has informed any of the proposed policies.</p> <p>Please do listen to the local residents before allowing Council planners to exploit and destroy a well balanced, residential area already up to full capacity for the local infrastructure. Please do not let the SMBC planners and Independent Developers (with their own Agenda) evaporate every piece of green belt that exists in our area. We will never get it back.</p>	<p>The NP does not make site allocations. Matters to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	
<p>I am writing to provide input regarding the latest version of the KDBH Neighbourhood Plan. I very much hope that these comments and suggestions will be taken into account in finalising the Neighbourhood Plan in order to protect the amenities of the villages of Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath. Please acknowledge receipt of these representations.</p> <p>Additionally whilst the housing allocations still have yet to be finalised by SMBC in the next draft, there is clear feedback from the Residents Survey in 06/16 that 98% of respondents (out of total response from 2481 respondents) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of greater than 500+ houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the Triangle being approximately 750 houses. I would request that the plan is significantly amended to take account of the input from the June 2016 Residents Survey.</p> <p>At the Developer Showcase event in 07/16 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list but the Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.</p> <p>There were 11 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt.</p> <p><b>Cont.</b> There are other significant benefits to a more dispersed sites approach, being that the alternative locations are more sustainable in terms of transport accessibility; multiple smaller developments will increase competition amongst developers and provide a variety of design and house types; the pace of overall development would be significantly increased when compared to the single large site development pace from a large developer (Taylor Wimpey or similar) rolling out 50-60 houses a year as they have at Middlefield.</p> <p>I do not see where this evidence has informed any of the proposed policies and strongly urge that these facts are taken into account, and reflected in the next revision of the draft plan. Specifically by amending the plan to position a dispersed multiple small site approach as the preferred option.</p> <p>Being a relative new comer to the area, having moved to Grove Road in September 2017, I do not have a personal history or lengthy involvement with the discussions to date. That said, I believe it is imperative that the preferences of the neighbourhood community, as represented by the 2481 respondents to the June 2016 survey are accepted as fact, and reflected accurately and impactfully in the draft plan. The revised draft should support strongly a multiple small site solution composing Arden Academy and adjoining land, Knowle FC /Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road and oppose a large site solution south of Lansdowne – with the site south of Lansdowne, at North side of Grove Road, Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road being retained as Green Belt.</p>	<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	
<p>The proposed School site should be reviewed. By burying the school in the middle of the proposed housing development it will cause traffic chaos as developers tend to build narrow roads on housing estates. A road 1 1/2 times the width of Station Road is needed to feed the school where proposed as Station Road now gets clogged up with traffic between 8.00 - 8.50am and between 3.00-4.00pm. In addition it is proposed that children will use the bridle path to walk to the school. There is a massive Health &amp; Safety issue with that in that there are between 80 - 100 vehicle movements along this route daily. Some of these being large lorries, long well based vans as well as cars making the bridle path unsuitable for hundreds of children. to date even single pedestrians have to step onto very narrow grass verges to avoid this existing traffic. A more realistic site for the School would be on the Warwick Road at the top of Stripes Hill with a 1500 - 2000 car park space immediately behind the houses in Milverton Road with a new school adjacent to it. This car park not only will allow staff, pupils &amp; parents to park but would also increase parking facilities for Knowle shoppers. This site is only about 300 metres to the shops on Station Road (less than a 5 minute walk). Then the new Estate of houses will not be clogged by school traffic, particularly on Open Evenings, Prom Nights or ordinary everyday school traffic. I believe whatever SMBC approve this would be a more realistic way of accommodating the needs of Knowle for the long term.</p>	<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	

<b>Housing</b>		<b>Action Taken</b>
<b>Source / Comment</b>	<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	
<p>I am writing to express my views on the proposals from SMBC around the Arden Triangle site.</p> <p>Whilst I recognise that new housing needs to happen, it's the scale of the development at Arden Triangle that concerns me. I wish to oppose the development of the Arden Triangle within the KDBH Neighbourhood Draft Plan. The existing infrastructure and facilities of Knowle and Dorridge are already very stretched - the local school nursery, infant and junior departments are already oversubscribed and existing children in the area have to go on waiting lists for a school place. The medical practices struggle and this affects residents ability to access care in a timely manner. Car parking is becoming a problem and the roads are already very busy. The proposed increase in the population by building on Green Belt in the Arden Triangle, Grove Road (North side) would change the existing 'village' environment and lead to congestion throughout a small area.</p> <p>I understand that the housing allocations have still yet to be finalised by SMBC in their next draft. However, there was clear feedback from the Residents Survey in June 2016 that 98% of respondents (out of 2481) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of 500+ houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the Triangle is c.750. I disagree with this size of development on one site when there are opportunities to spread the development across a number of areas around KDBH.</p> <p>At the Developer Showcase event in July 2016 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list but the Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.</p>	<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> There were 11 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt. There are other benefits to this more dispersed sites approach as some of the alternative locations are more sustainable in transport accessibility and proximity and access to locations where local residents are likely to work , eg Blythe Valley, Solihull, access to motorway networks etc. Dispersed sites would increase competition amongst developers and give variety of design and house types and finally improve the pace of overall development instead of waiting for Taylor Wimpey or similar to roll out 50-60 houses a year as they have at Middlefield.</p> <p>I have lived in Knowle for some 17 years and we have children along with many of our friends, so we recognise the need to upgrade Arden Academy to cope with increasing demand. I hope the planners can see that there is a better balance that can be struck rather than sticking 750+ new houses on one site. Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath is a really lovely place to live and work, but I do fear that if Council planners don't listen to local residents' views and adopt a more balanced approach, the area/environment locally will be damaged and we will not be able to turn back time.</p>	<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	
<p>Rebuilding or replacing Arden Academy is a powerful opportunity in its potential to bring new high density housing close to the centre of Knowle and provide improved school facilities but the case for funding has not yet been made clear and we would certainly not support proposals for further housing land than is necessary, south of Lansdowne House for instance.</p> <p>There was clear feedback from the Residents Survey in 06/16 that 98% of respondents (out of 2481) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of 500+ houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the draft allocation by SMBC in the 'Triangle' is c.750. We do not see how this is consistent with preserving the setting and character of Knowle.</p> <p>At the Developer Showcase event in 07/16 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list and the Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.</p> <p>There were 11 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt.</p> <p>There are other benefits to this more dispersed sites approach as some of the alternatives are more sustainable in transport accessibility, it would increase competition amongst developers and give variety of design and house types and finally improve the pace of overall development instead of waiting for Taylor Wimpey or similar to roll out 50-60 houses a year as they have at Middlefield.</p> <p>I do not see where this evidence has been followed up in any of the proposed policies and the Forum should reflect these alternative supported allocations in any revision to the Plan.</p>	<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	

<b>Housing</b>		<b>Action Taken</b>
<b>Source / Comment</b>	<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	
<p>I wish to oppose the development of the Arden Triangle within the KDBH Neighbourhood Draft Plan. The existing infrastructure of Knowle and Dorridge is bursting at the seams, the local school nursery, infant and junior departments are already oversubscribed and existing children in the area have to go on waiting lists for a school place. Dr's surgeries are full to their capacities. Car parks already at maximum capacity and the main roads around the area already very busy. The proposed increase in the population by building on Green Belt in the Arden Triangle, Grove Road (North side) would change the existing 'village' environment and lead to congestion throughout a small area.</p> <p>Also I would like to add that the point to the Forum that whilst the housing allocations still have yet to be finalised by SMBC in their next draft, there was clear feedback from the Residents Survey in June 2016 that 98% of respondents (out of 2481) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of 500+ houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the Triangle is c.750.</p> <p>At the Developer Showcase event in July 2016 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list but the Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.</p> <p>There were 11 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt.</p> <p>There are other benefits to this more dispersed sites approach as some of the alternative locations are more sustainable in transport accessibility, it would increase competition amongst developers and give variety of design and house types and finally improve the pace of overall development instead of waiting for Taylor Wimpey or similar to roll out 50-60 houses a year as they have at Middlefield.</p> <p>I do not see where this evidence has informed any of the proposed policies.</p> <p>Please do listen to the local residents before allowing Council planners to exploit and destroy a well balanced, residential area already up to full capacity for the local infrastructure. Please do not let the SMBC planners and Independent Developers (with their own Agenda) evaporate every piece of green belt that exists in our area. We will never get it back.</p>	<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	
<p>Density of developments and Dispersal of housing sites. In the interests of maintaining the character of the area, which for most residents is a priority, it makes sense not to concentrate all the development in one or two site areas but to disperse it as widely as possible. There are a number of potential development sites already earmarked and these should be used, thereby reducing the need for so many houses in the Arden Triangle.</p> <p>I wish to oppose the development of the Arden Triangle within the KDBH Neighbourhood Draft Plan. The existing infrastructure of Knowle and Dorridge is bursting at the seams, the local school nursery, infant and junior departments are already oversubscribed and existing children in the area have to go on waiting lists for a school place. GP surgeries are full to their capacities. Car parks already at maximum capacity and the main roads around the area already very busy. The proposed increase in the population by building on Green Belt in the Arden Triangle, Grove Road (North side) would change the existing 'village' environment and lead to congestion throughout a small area.</p> <p>Also I would like to add that the point to the Forum that whilst the housing allocations still have yet to be finalised by SMBC in their next draft, there was clear feedback from the Residents Survey in June 2016 that 98% of respondents (out of 2481) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of 500+ houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the Triangle is c.750.</p> <p>At the Developer Showcase event in July 2016 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list but the Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.</p> <p>There were 11 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt.</p> <p>There are other benefits to this more dispersed sites approach as some of the alternative locations are more sustainable in transport accessibility, it would increase competition amongst developers and give variety of design and house types and finally improve the pace of overall development instead of waiting for Taylor Wimpey or similar to roll out 50-60 houses a year as they have at Middlefield.</p> <p>I do not see where this evidence has informed any of the proposed policies.</p> <p>Please do listen to the local residents before allowing Council planners to exploit and destroy a well balanced, residential area already up to full capacity for the local infrastructure. Please do not let the SMBC planners and Independent Developers (with their own Agenda) evaporate every piece of green belt that exists in our area. We will never get it back.</p>	<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	
<p>I wish to oppose the development of the Arden Triangle within the KDBH Neighbourhood Draft Plan. The existing infrastructure of Knowle and Dorridge is bursting at the seams, the local school nursery, infant and junior departments are already oversubscribed and existing children in the area have to go on waiting lists for a school place. GP surgeries are full to their capacities. Car parks already at maximum capacity and the main roads around the area already very busy. The proposed increase in the population by building on Green Belt in the Arden Triangle, Grove Road (North side) would change the existing 'village' environment and lead to congestion throughout a small area.</p> <p>Also I would like to add that the point to the Forum that whilst the housing allocations still have yet to be finalised by SMBC in their next draft, there was clear feedback from the Residents Survey in June 2016 that 98% of respondents (out of 2481) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of 500+ houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the Triangle is c.750.</p> <p>At the Developer Showcase event in July 2016 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list but the Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.</p> <p>There were 11 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt.</p> <p>There are other benefits to this more dispersed sites approach as some of the alternative locations are more sustainable in transport accessibility, it would increase competition amongst developers and give variety of design and house types and finally improve the pace of overall development instead of waiting for Taylor Wimpey or similar to roll out 50-60 houses a year as they have at Middlefield.</p> <p>I do not see where this evidence has informed any of the proposed policies.</p> <p>Please do listen to the local residents before allowing Council planners to exploit and destroy a well balanced, residential area already up to full capacity for the local infrastructure. Please do not let the SMBC planners and Independent Developers (with their own Agenda) evaporate every piece of green belt that exists in our area. We will never get it back.</p>	<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	

<b>Housing</b>		<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
<b>Source / Comment</b>			
<p>I wish to oppose the development of the Arden Triangle within the KDBH Neighbourhood Draft Plan. The existing infrastructure of Knowle and Dorridge is bursting at the seams, the local school nursery, infant and junior departments are already oversubscribed and existing children in the area have to go on waiting lists for a school place. Dr's surgeries are full to their capacities. Car parks already at maximum capacity and the main roads around the area already very busy. The proposed increase in the population by building on Green Belt in the Arden Triangle, Grove Road (North side) would change the existing 'village' environment and lead to congestion throughout a small area.</p> <p>I attach a document - the contents of the document represent concerns expressed in a number of conversations with residents of Knowle which have been translated into formal representations with the help of a professional planning colleague.</p> <p>Also I would like to add that the point to the Forum that whilst the housing allocations still have yet to be finalised by SMBC in their next draft, there was clear feedback from the Residents Survey in June 2016 that 98% of respondents (out of 2481) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of 500+ houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the Triangle is c.750.</p> <p>At the Developer Showcase event in July 2016 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list but the Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.</p> <p>There were 11 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt.</p> <p>There are other benefits to this more dispersed sites approach as some of the alternative locations are more sustainable in transport accessibility, it would increase competition amongst developers and give variety of design and house types and finally improve the pace of overall development instead of waiting for Taylor Wimpey or similar to roll out 50-60 houses a year as they have at Middlefield.</p> <p>I do not see where this evidence has informed any of the proposed policies.</p> <p>Please do listen to the local residents before allowing Council planners to exploit and destroy a well balanced, residential area already up to full capacity for the local infrastructure. Please do not let the SMBC planners and Independent Developers (with their own Agenda) evaporate every piece of green belt that exists in our area. We will never get it back.</p>		<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	
<p>I support all policies in Section 7 except 7.2. and 7.8.</p> <p>I believe more houses than 500 are needed in our community in order to address the wishes and needs of our population – eg housing shortage, affordability; homes for older people; housing for young families.</p> <p>Windfall housing should only be acceptable if it makes a contribution towards community benefit rather just profit and income for those fortunate to have land available.</p>		<p>Noted. The NP provides for more than 500 houses as windfalls add significantly to the total. Windfalls will come forward. They relieve pressure on green belt land are considered acceptable subject to the provisions in Policy H7.</p>	
<p>I am writing to provide input regarding the latest version of the KDBH Neighbourhood Plan. I hope that these comments and suggestions will be taken into account in finalising the Neighbourhood Plan in order to protect the amenities of the villages of Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath. Please acknowledge receipt of these representations.</p> <p>The contents of the document attached represent concerns expressed in a number of conversations with residents of Knowle which have been translated into formal representations with the help of a professional planning colleague.</p> <p>Whilst the housing allocations still have yet to be finalised by SMBC in the next draft, there is clear feedback from the Residents Survey in 06/16 that 98% of respondents (out of total response from 2481 respondents) disagreed or strongly disagreed with developments of greater than 500+houses and similarly 96% objected to schemes of 101-500. The total aggregate of the sites in the Triangle being approximately 750 houses. I would request that the plan is significantly amended to take account of the input from the June 2016 Residents Survey.</p> <p>At the Developer Showcase event in 07/16 none of the proposed sites in southern part of the 'Arden Triangle' appeared in the 'most supported sites' list but the Land at Grove Road (North side) was one of the top 3 'most opposed' along with Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road.</p> <p>There were &gt;10 other 'most supported sites' including Arden Academy and the adjoining land, Knowle F.C./Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road which would all have significant capacity to more than compensate if the sites south of Lansdowne were retained as green belt.</p> <p>There are other significant benefits to a more dispersed sites approach, being that the alternative locations are more sustainable in terms of transport accessibility; multiple smaller developments will increase competition amongst developers and provide a variety of design and house types; the pace of overall development would be significantly increased when compared to the single large site development pace from a large developer rolling out 50-60 houses a year as they have at Middlefield.</p> <p>I do not see where this evidence has informed any of the proposed policies and strongly urge that these facts are taken into account, and reflected in the next revision of the draft plan. Specifically by amending the plan to position a dispersed multiple small site approach as the preferred option.</p> <p>Being a relative new comer to the area, having moved to Grove Road in September 2017, I do not have a personal history or lengthy involvement with the discussions to date. That said, I believe it is imperative that the preferences of the neighbourhood community, as represented by the 2481 respondents to the June 2016 survey are accepted as fact, and reflected accurately and impactfully in the draft plan. The revised draft should support strongly a multiple small site solution composing Arden Academy and adjoining land, Knowle FC /Hampton Road, Smiths Lane and Four Ashes/Box Trees Road and oppose a large site solution south of Lansdowne – with the site south of Lansdowne, at North side of Grove Road, Dorridge Road and Blue Lake Road being retained as Green Belt.</p>		<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	
<p>I am an owner of the land marked on the map below. I would like to put it forward as a possible development site for housing in your neighbourhood plan. If you would like me to provide any further information I am on the email above.</p>		<p>The NP does not make site allocations. It focuses on improving design and layout irrespective of which site come forward. Scale of development and site selection to be pursued through Local Plan representations.</p>	

<b>Housing</b>		<b>Action Taken</b>
<b>Source / Comment</b>	<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	
<p>1. I wish to express my concern that the plan itself focus too heavily on the needs of elderly residents, especially in the consideration of housing type. I am also unclear as to where the estimate of sheltered housing etc needs come from. This position does not seem to mirror the findings of the independent HNA. I absolutely support the principle that the long term needs of elderly residents needs to be addressed, supported and enabled, which naturally includes enabling them to remain within the area in suitable accommodation. I support the policies general intent in this regard. However, other groups - young and older families, couples, single people etc - also have needs; the NP seems to have a disproportionate focus on the needs of elderly residents at the expense of the others. I am unclear as to the justification for this.</p> <p>2. I note that a housing number of 'around 500' is quoted in the policy but not in the 'essential reading'. At previous meetings many people have opposed any development in KDBH. It seems remiss, therefore, that the NF's recognition that 'around 500' house are warranted is not stated in the essential reading.</p> <p>3. Regarding the number itself, I am unclear as to its origin. Only the executive summary of the independent HNA is available on the website. This document states that '478 dwellings were built in the plan area between 2001 and 2016 and...These have been taken into consideration in arriving at the projections'. I understand this to mean that the projections have already been reduced by this amount, so the quoted number are the additional housing required as of today. At the NF meeting on the 10th Jan 2018, however, the NF stated that this figure (plus additional windfall housing) should be deducted from the projections. The HNA goes on to state that "A specific account of how this was done...is set out in paragraph 62,67, and 75 of the main body of the report". I have now requested a copy of the full report on two separate occasions; however I have yet to receive a copy, nor any explanation as to why the NF have not provided one. It is my contention that without making the full report available, the number of 500 houses in the NP is unjustified by the evidence base. I therefore wish to express my objection to this number and its inclusion in the final NP until the full report is made available, calculations presented transparently and the number justified.</p>	<p>1. The NP provides for a range of accommodation types and sizes having regard to the evidence base, views and feedback. 2. Noted. NP needs to make a proportionate contribution to meeting housing need as discussed at NF meetings and reflected in this draft policy. 3. Noted.</p>	
<p>H1: There is little discussion in the draft of the basis for the suggested 500 houses (derived from the local Housing Needs Assessment document). Surely as a critical section this should be expanded?</p> <p>Is the assumption to simply rely directly on the consultants derived forecast number at present, - being less than SMBC's calculated figure? Reasons why a lower figure may be preferred by the KDBH NP are not set out here. Should not the reasons behind the objections to the SMBC Local Plan review numbers (missing assessments, plan consistency, etc.) form part of this NP document too?</p> <p>In my view it should be argued that the number proposed should be less than 500, hence I disagree with H1 in the online feedback.</p> <p>H2: Much of the comment and justification in this section is a repeat of that under other headings, such as Traffic and Transport in particular. This duplication is unnecessary.</p> <p>H4: I do not fully understand the basis for what is being recommended here, apart from the fact that it seems to be a cut and paste from the consultant's HNA document. My "undecided" feedback online reflects that there is no discussion of why levels of particular types of housing may be required.</p> <p>H6: For me this wording is unclear who is seeking to downsize - older people? If so, this should be stated, since it would mean a specific age profile in apartment style housing needs. I don't think I agree with this, if so.</p> <p>H7: Is this necessary in this document - isn't the aim of this policy covered by existing Council requirements / guidance?</p> <p>H8: See H7 above - furthermore, this seems insignificant compared to other matters under this heading / in this section.</p>	<p>H4 under review. H6-apartments are regarded as suitable for all smaller households. The point is simply that if they are to appeal to those who wish to downsize they should be of adequate size. H7 and H8 comments noted. Policies are relevant.</p>	Y
<p>Further to our conversation tonight; - We discussed defining the phrase "High quality housing", by giving examples eg. :- the McCarthy &amp; Stone development on the High Street, where the old garage was, as being superb and the new houses on the right of Hampton Lane, before the football ground, as being atrocious. Similarly this idea could be extended to all policies.</p>	<p>Noted but not considered necessary.</p>	
<p>On page 27, second paragraph after the box, there is reference to use of the site of St George and St Teresa Catholic Primary School (suggest consistency of title if used more than once). It is not clear how this concept has come into the Plan. The only evidence that had come to the Forum with regard to capacity and suitability of school buildings is data from the LA to suggest that there might need to be an extra ½ form entry at primary level if there is extensive house building (eg 1000+) and some reduction in out of area placements in local schools. Further work is needed to establish where the greatest need might be. Other than this, the Forum Plan has not mentioned, correctly so, specific organisations that are seeking to improve or expand their buildings or provision through linkage with housing developers. This is not to oppose such proposals, but to remain evidence focused about what might be the best use of public funds without anticipating outcomes.</p>	<p>This relates to H4 Housing. The paragraph addresses the possibility of the redevelopment of the RC school site. However, the Neighbourhood Forum is not promoting redevelopment.</p>	Y
<b>VIA LIBRARY</b>		
<p>While KDBH has a reputation for being a rather affluent area, to maintain its future development and character all areas of housing must be carefully considered in line with the facilities and amenities it can sustain. Over development could prove a complete disaster.</p>	<p>Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.</p>	
<p>There should be an absolute maximum of 500 homes - otherwise Knowle will resemble a dormitory town. 40% affordable is too high a proportion of the total housing. Apartment blocks are not an attractive feature of a town. Is windfall housing and underhand way to garden grab? Many people have been let down by the council refusing to endorse the original planning consent.</p>	<p>The NP needs to make a proportionate contribution to meeting housing needs. Imposing a maximum has been rejected by Inspectors. 40% affordable is Council policy.</p>	
<p>Maximum of 500 new houses. If we are not careful we will destroy the whole character of the area. Do not agree with the SMBC 40% affordable rule. Too much affordable housing will inevitably dilute the quality of the area. Blocks of apartments do not enhance the character of an area. If Windfall housing means garden grabbing I don't agree. The council has a history of not enforcing its planning consents.</p>	<p>The NP needs to make a proportionate contribution to meeting housing needs. Imposing a maximum has been rejected by Inspectors. 40% affordable is Council policy.</p>	
<p>Restrict the volume proposed. I live in the first phase of Middlefield Spring Development and already 3 to 4 properties are "Buy to Let". While I appreciate rentals are important parts of housing landscape I have longer term concerns that profile of residents changes and a more transient population affect community. The two bed houses are a good size but lack garages etc. The development salesperson said she wishes she had more of the smaller 3/4 bed houses available.</p>	<p>The NP needs to make a proportionate contribution to meeting housing needs. Housing size and mix under review.</p>	
<p>Too many houses for KDBH area to absorb without major impact</p>	<p>The NP needs to make a proportionate contribution to meeting housing needs.</p>	
<p>The current housing is far too dense. More space needed for houses being built</p>	<p>Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.</p>	

<b>Housing</b>		<b>Action Taken</b>
<b>Source / Comment</b>	<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	
Strongly agree that the Draft LP allocation of 1050 new units is way too large. The impact, especially on transport/pollution on major routes will be excessive even with a reduced allocation of 500 dwellings. It is acknowledged 1-3 cars assumed per dwelling equates to up to 1500 more cars moving up and down the Warwick Road each day.	Noted. Maintain objections to scale through Local Plan process.	
Have concerns about restriction to 500 houses over the period of the Neighbourhood Plan given the West Midlands future housing needs. Consider that a higher figure would be more realistic given th policies H3, 4 and 5.	Noted. Neighbourhood Plan reflects prevailing view but ultimately determined by Solihull MBC Local Plan policy. No action.	
H1 You have no power to control the numbers, therefore your statement that it will be "about 500" is misleading and almost inevitably wrong. You will look rather stupid if, as proposed by SMBC it turns out to be 1050, and the Plan will be obsolete. What will your voters think then? Also, if SMBC ultimately decides on <u>no</u> new sites in KDBH - you can't allocate 500. You refer to the former by-pass land at Wychwood, which is fair enough because ti is vacant land, but is in any event a "wndfall site". However, St. George and St. Theresa's is still a school so you can't count on that being redeveloped. The 2013 LDP envisaged windfall sites coming forward right up until 2028 and they pop up all the time so why pick on these two, when overall the number of windfalls is likely to be much higher? You can't promote less development on allocated sites otherwise you will be in breach of NPPF, you can't allocate Green Belt sites and you have no idea what total windfalls will be between now and 2033. Furthermore, there will ne another review of the Local Plan about 5 years after adoption of the current view, so it is pointless and inappropriate for you to have any policy on "Scale of new housing". However, you could make <u>truthful</u> comments about the likely scale which is currently foreseeable. Your report on KDBH's own needs is all very interesting, but SMBC does not have enough land elsewhere to meet the overall needs of the Borough and is also obliged to help Birmingham with its "missing" 37500. You can't declare "NIMBY UDI" for KDBH. The purpose of a NP is to set out policies for land use and development, it is not supposed to be an opprtunity for you to bitch about objections you have made to the current Local Plan review. That is a separate matter and your objections are no more important than anyone else's. Your second paragraph of comment is only partly true - only <u>some</u> local people have objected, the vaste majority have not, so again you are stating something untrue and misleading. The fact that you made objections is antient history now, SMBC is fully aware and your attempt to somehow aggrandise <u>your</u> objections by referring to them in thsi document is inappropriate. Anyway, that was only a preliminary consultation on the Draft LP - the forthcoming statutory consultation on the "Submission Version" is much more important, and no doubt you will object then as well. The second paragraph has no place in this documentand should be deleted.	Noted. Neighbourhood Plan reflects prevailing view but ultimately determined by Solihull MBC Local Plan policy. No action.	
<b>SMBC</b>		
Housing		
1.11 The Neighbourhood Plan's comprehensive approach to considering housing size, type and mix to meet the needs of local residents is to be welcomed. Policy H1: Scale of New Housing		
1.12 Whilst Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the adopted Local Plan (which is currently the 2013 Solihull Local Plan), this is currently being reviewed. As the draft Local Plan proposes significantly more housing on potential site allocations in KDBH than identified in the draft Neighbourhood Plan, there is a danger that Policy H1 will be superseded should the draft Local Plan be taken forward in its current form. 1.13 Although the Neighbourhood Forum suggest that 440 – 540 dwellings would be required to meet local housing need, it is important to note that the scale of housing proposed for the area in the draft Local Plan seeks to meet more than local need, as well as contributing to the shortfall in the wider housing market area (HMA). Whilst the Neighbourhood Forum's objection to the scale of growth proposed for KDBH in the draft Local Plan is acknowledged, there is insufficient land available in the urban area to meet the Borough's overall housing need. The draft Neighbourhood Plan gives no recognition to this, nor does it account for any contribution to the HMA shortfall. 1.14 In the current review of the Local Plan, Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath has been identified as an area that has the potential to accommodate significant growth due to the high quality of facilities, accessibility and other sustainability factors. The Council does not therefore consider that Policy H1 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan would contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and the scale of growth identified in the Policy is not supported.	The Forum's local Housing Needs Assessment follows the recommended methodology. There is no particular requirement to make a contribution to the wider HMA shortfall particularly in circumstances where significant growth in KDBH would be unsustainable. No change.	
Policy H2: Housing on Allocated Sites and Larger Sites		
1.15 The Council supports the development of concept masterplans in collaboration with site promoters, stakeholders and local communities, to shape new strategic developments. Indeed, concept masterplans are currently being prepared for all proposed site allocations in the draft Local Plan. For sites in KDBH, the Neighbourhood Forum have been, and will continue be included in discussions and the use of evidence prepared in support of the Neighbourhood Plan will be valuable in this process. 1.16 However, there is concern over the expectation that a full concept masterplan / design brief be prepared in consultation with the Neighbourhood Forum prior to the submission of a planning application for developments of 20+ dwellings. Whilst both the Government and the Council encourage applicants to involve the wider community at an early stage in the development of their proposals, there is no statutory requirement for community and stakeholder involvement at the pre-application stage of the process. 1.17 Notwithstanding this, the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) requires major development proposals to demonstrate how the local community has been consulted and engaged in the design process and suggests examples about how this can be achieved. In addition, local validation criteria would also require applications for major residential development to include a range of information such as a character assessment, landscape and public realm strategy, parking and access plan, transport assessment / statement as well as a design and access statement. Therefore, it is considered that the principal aims of Policy H2 would not be undermined if the policy were amended to 'encourage' the preparation of concept masterplans/ design briefs for sites prior to submission of a planning application. However, the Council could not invalidate a planning application or refuse planning permission due to a lack of community consultation at pre-application stage.	Noted. Policy H2 sets out the expectation with regard to consultation. The NF would look for compliance and for consultation with the NF to be confirmed and addressed in the Statement of Community Involvement. However, it is recognised that a failure to comply would not of itself invalidate a planning application.	

<b>Housing</b>		<b>Action Taken</b>
<b>Source / Comment</b>	<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	
<p><b>Cont. 1.18</b> With regard to density in KDBH, the draft Neighbourhood Plan states that housing densities in the area are typically less than 20 dwellings per hectare. However, the Housing Density Map at Appendix 1 of the Plan does not map all areas and a number of more recent higher density developments are excluded. It should also be recognised that higher density developments can be provided without necessarily having an adverse impact on the character &amp; appearance of the area.</p> <p>1.19 Whilst the Council agrees that new development should reflect the locality, it is also important to ensure that land is used efficiently, particularly where the use of Green Belt is necessary to accommodate new development. An appropriate balance has to be struck and it is important to understand that lower densities would see a reduction in the number of houses that could be accommodated, which would in turn require the release of additional land to meet housing need. The Council considers that higher density development can be designed to ensure it does not detract from the character of the area, whilst also making the most efficient use of land.</p> <p>1.20 The design guidance around re-routed public rights of way could be strengthened to ensure that routes are, where possible, provided through attractive settings rather than narrow, barren footpaths between walls/fences.</p> <p>Policy H3: Affordable Housing</p>	<p>Noted. The provisions of the NP would not preclude efficient use of land / provision of higher densities in appropriate circumstances. On design guidance around re-routed rights of way, the Council's suggestion has been adopted.</p>	Y
<p>1.21 Whilst the Council acknowledges the reason for the Policy, particularly with reference to the Housing Policy Goal to meet the needs of the residents of Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath, the provision of affordable housing is a strategic, borough-wide issue.</p> <p>1.22 Policy P4a) of the adopted Solihull Local Plan sets out the Council's approach to the provision of affordable housing. The policy is set on a Borough-wide basis which reflects the fact that needs cannot always be met where they arise and that use has to be made of the development opportunities that become available. Therefore, any development may be required to provide for needs arising in another part of the Borough, not just local needs. The only exception to this may be on rural 'exceptions' sites where housing may be reserved for those with a local connection. It is intended that this approach is maintained in the current review of the Solihull Local Plan.</p> <p>1.23 In its existing form, Policy H3 could result in someone in KDBH who falls within a much lower priority for housing need being given preference over someone who is in a much higher priority housing need, but has lived in KDBH for only 2 years (or who lives elsewhere in the Borough). Therefore, the fact that all new affordable housing shall first be offered to households with a strong local connection to the area is not considered to be consistent with the Council's approach to providing affordable housing.</p> <p>1.24 It is suggested that around 25 – 50% of lettings should be first offered to those with a local connection. This would ensure that both the needs of Knowle Dorridge and Bentley Heath residents are met as well as meeting more strategic Borough wide needs for those requiring affordable housing.</p> <p>Policy H4: House Types</p>	<p>The NF's proposals are considered to be appropriate. The Forum considers that all local affordable housing should be made available to those with a strong local connection. However, new text has been added to confirm what would happen if there were no qualifying households with a strong local connection.</p>	Y
<p>1.25 The NPPF states that the pursuit of sustainable development includes widening the choice of high quality homes. Local planning authorities should deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities, planning for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community.</p> <p>1.26 There appears to be an inconsistency between section 4.2 which highlights a shifting demand towards smaller house types and the requirements of policies H4 &amp; H5 which are seeking a higher proportion of larger houses.</p> <p>1.27 It is considered that Policy H4 would maintain a high number of detached houses in the area. This is not compatible with aims of widening the choice of homes, planning for a mix of housing and creating sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. Detached homes generally demand a higher sale price, make less efficient use of land and would continue the trend of KDBH having higher proportion of detached houses than elsewhere in the Borough and being one of the least affordable areas of the Borough for home ownership and private rent. Semi-detached and terraced homes, as well as apartment blocks/maisonettes can be designed to respond to the local character and distinctiveness of the surrounding area and streetscape.</p> <p>1.28 It is therefore recommended that the policy is more flexible and responds to balancing the housing market and creating more inclusive communities.</p> <p>Policy H5: House Size</p>	<p>In response to various representations, amendments have been made to Policies H4 and H5. However, prescriptive policies are necessary if the objectives of the policies are to be met.</p>	Y
<p>1.29 The Council welcomes reference to its Strategic Housing Market Assessment Part 2 and to the Borough-wide need for certain house types and sizes. However, as with Policy H4, the policy would not balance the housing market as there exists a high proportion of 4+bed homes that are under-occupied.</p> <p>1.30 The Council would recommend a less prescriptive approach to house sizes that takes account of local needs to, for example, down-size and provide suitable homes for young families.</p> <p>Policy H8: Extensions and Alterations</p>	<p>H5 amended.</p>	Y
<p>1.31 Whilst the Policy title is 'Extensions and Alterations' the reference in the text to 'planning permission for residential development' could imply something wider. In addition, although the supporting text seeks to define what 'residential development' comprises, the term 'most likely to comprise' along with phrase 'and the like', provides an element of ambiguity to the policy. It is recommended that the policy be amended to provide more clarity for the decision maker.</p> <p>1.32 In addition, the Council would suggest that use of the phrase 'within the boundary of dwelling houses' be amended to refer to the 'curtilage' as the boundary of a dwelling house may be significantly more extensive than its domestic curtilage.</p>	<p>Agreed. Amend plan.</p>	Y
<b>OFFICIAL CONSULTEES</b>		
<p><b>THE KNOWLE SOCIETY.</b> Finally, under Appendix 1, a minor point but one nonetheless important for the sake of accuracy, the date shown of the Wychwood Avenue/Broadfern Road/Holland Avenue is incorrect – it started in the late 1920's and finally finished in the mid 1960's; that of Purnells Way was not completed before the late 1970's; and the houses between Tilehouse Green Lane and Brown's Lane were underway by the late 1970's and finished by the mid 1980's.</p>	<p>Agreed. Amend plan.</p>	Y

Design		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE AT LAUNCH OF DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 25/11/17</b>		
28 - If housing is to be built in a lovely area such as this it should be of the highest quality.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	Y
31 - Only in keeping with the area - no tower blocks!	Agree. Plan amended	
58 - Do not build on Green belt land.	Noted. The NP needs to make a proportionate contribution to meeting housing need. No action.	
83 - Agree.		
89 - See comment under VC4. The design must incorporate adequate green space.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
108 - Essential.		
145 - The 'village' identity must be preserved.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
<b>MENTIMETER</b>		
I support the policy		
D2: I oppose requirement for parking AND garage .Locally low % of garages are used for cars,increasing on-street parking, instead this policy should just require provision for parking spaces alone in line with other policies.	The policy does not require garages for all new residential development. It is directed towards the size of space being adequate.	
The caveat about not stifling innovative good design should be reinforced positively so as to encourage variety and quality.	Not considered necessary. No action.	
The area must not petrify. Some good quality modern development sends a strong message about area vitality though scale is important.	Noted. No action.	
Add-"Parking spaces for cars of all the expected occupants."	Adequately covered by Policy T1.	
Add-eg. Shop fronts, roofs etc. should be in Victorian style and not 1950-90's.	Considered to be too restrictive. No action.	
No strong views either way it is good to retain character.		
<b>VIA WEBSITE</b>		
D1: Isn't much of this policy covered by existing rules and regulations? What is new / additional is not easily apparent to a lay person.	It is to some extent. This policy is intended to strengthen existing policies and guidance.	
<b>VIA LIBRARY</b>		
Essential to maintain the future and existing character of KDBH	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
Commendable criteria - if only it all could be achieved		
There are many subjective elements here - best of luck!		
Roads in the Middlefield Spring Development are very narrow and driveway space limited. Agree developments need to be able to accommodate residents parking but also visitors, deliveries etc.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
Light pollution is not mentioned anywhere. I would like to see intelligent LED lighting low to the ground to reduce the spread of light.	This has not proved to be a significant issue. No action.	Y
Increased light pollution will affect the village community. Limitations should also be applied to security lighting,		
Some concern that this may be used to resist infill development which would result in a higher density of housing.		
8.2 Policy D1 repeats a lot of requirements in mentioned in Section 6.	Section 6 focuses on improving design and layout of allocated sites. D1 is generic.	
Policy D2 may not fall into the use of land and new development category.		
<b>SMBC</b>		
Policy D1: Character and Appearance		
1.33 At the time of writing the Heritage and Character Assessment 2017 and the Masterplanning and Design Coding Study 2017 referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan evidence base has not been published. Therefore, the Council reserves the right to comment further on this policy once these evidence base documents are available.		
1.34 The supporting text also states that 'parts of the area are particularly sensitive to change'. Although conservation areas are cited, it is unclear which other parts of the area this refers to.	1.33 Noted. Will be made available. 1.34 Amend to refer to Conservations Areas and listed buildings. 1.34 Text amended.	
1.35 The Neighbourhood Forum are invited to consider how the design policies of the NP could be strengthened to include more precise guidance - especially in relation to potential 'cramming' to avoid situations whereby new buildings are provided with insufficient 'territory' and landscaping to enable them to be assimilated into a streetscene.		Y

Design		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p>Policy D2: Design in Conservation Areas</p> <p>1.36 Appendix 5 of the draft Plan provides a summary of the key principles that apply to the design of shop fronts and advertisements in conservation areas as referred to in Policy D2. It is considered that bullet point 2 of appendix 5 is ambiguous in that it refers to things that will generally be considered inappropriate in an historic context, but then states that such applications will be refused.</p> <p>1.37 Bullet point 3 refers to free standing poster-type signs. However, if this refers to A-boards, it is important to note that these would require a license and not advertisement consent or planning permission.</p> <p>1.38 With regard to bullet point 4, it is also worth adding that 'The Council may require halo illuminated individual letters on some undesignated heritage assets, particularly when they are buildings within a conservation area.'</p> <p>1.39 Policy D2 specifically refers to Design in Conservation Areas. However, bullet point 5 of Appendix 5 needs further clarification as it is unclear whether it refers to conservation areas or whether it is seeking to include setting as an area outside a conservation area boundary.</p> <p>1.40 With regard to the 6th bullet point, it is important to note that planning appeals are often allowed for signs of external MDF or even painted metal panels, as requiring actual timber is unrealistic.</p>	<p>Agree. Plan amended</p>	
<b>OFFICIAL CONSULTEES</b>		
<p>Formal Representations on behalf of West Midlands Police Chief Constable.</p> <p>Policy D1 'Character and Appearance' 24. The CCWMP requests that Policy D1 'Character and Appearance' addresses the need to ensure new development considers the need to design out-crime and to design-in safety features, in consultation with West Midlands Police. Well-designed places can help to reduce the circumstances and opportunity for crime and increase public confidence and security also reducing the fear of crime. Sustainable communities can be maintained by effective design solutions which integrate well maintained public spaces, community facilities, residential developments, shops and parks into the surrounding development. We therefore recommend introduction of a new bullet point as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- create and maintain safe neighbourhoods by including measures to reduce crime and the fear of crime.</li> </ul> <p>25. The CCWMP also requests that the 'Design – Policy Goal' at paragraph 8.1, be amended to include the aspiration of securing safe new development schemes. The goal could be changed as follows with proposed additions in 'bold':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 'Our policies aim to secure housing and other development of a high quality of design and layout which protects and enhances the character and appearance of the built environment, creates and maintains safe and secure communities, harmonises with the rural setting of the Area and sits well in the landscape.'</li> </ul> <p><b>Cont.</b> 26. The local Police Senior Leadership Team and Neighbourhood Policing Unit will have detailed knowledge about site specific issues in respect of crime and safety and any needs arising from the proposed development growth in specific locations. Additionally, the centrally-based Design Out Crime Team (DOCT) have extensive knowledge of security measures and 'Designing Out Crime'. The CCWMP requests that the Senior Leadership Team, Local Policing Unit and CPDAs are engaged in policy implementation and delivery once the KDBH NP is 'made'.</p> <p>27. Given the recognised importance of prioritising safety and security within national, local and emerging planning policies, the CCWMP considers it important that the KDBH NP should include reference to the intention to work in partnership with the Police to promote safe and secure environments and communities to deliver the Plan's objectives in the policy supporting text.</p> <p><b>THE KNOWLE SOCIETY.</b> Bearing in mind the CAA, in its first two paragraphs headed "Key positive characteristics" coupled to 'Recommendations', has a total list of eighteen separate points. Unfortunately only some of which are mentioned in the draft NP with others being part of an unstated list in the draft NP under Policy D2 on page 32 but, as far as can be seen, not mentioned elsewhere. However, in the draft NP it is identified in the plan under Appendix 6 that the limit of 'primary' frontage is shown by the blue line to part of both sides of the High Street. By reference to the plan included in the CAA it can be seen that this blue line omits four single or groups of listed buildings, both on the western side of the High Street, with two to the north towards the Greswolde Hotel and two to the south towards Station Road. Taking them in numerical street number order from the north to the south, they are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1610 High Street - now a pair of semi-detached units comprising Bilash and Jade Palace cafes or, in the case of the latter, also as a take-away,</li> <li>2. 1622A High Street – a small office (or possibly a studio) occupied by Art's Cool, 1624 High Street – the entrance to first floor offices running over both 1626 and possibly 1628 High Street with a variety of tenants,</li> <li>1626 High Street – offices occupied by Estate Agents Hunters, and</li> <li>1628 High Street – Bella Venezia with its entrance via a small side extension (which is included in the Listing) immediately adjacent to the now empty former bank,</li> <li>3. 1672 High Street – The Red Lion Public House, and</li> <li>4. 1678 High Street – a single dwelling (there is only one centre chimney) now converted as two units but both currently occupied by the Elderberry Black's Café,</li> <li>1682 High Street – one of a pair of semi-detached units comprising Thomas Bragg's Funeral Parlour and</li> <li>1684 High Street – the second of the pair comprising Kent's Hairdressing, and finally</li> <li>1688 High Street – Stowe House, now a substantial office building with a variety of Tenants.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted. Amend.</p> <p>26. Noted. Neighbourhood Forum to follow up.</p>	<p>Y</p> <p>Y</p>

Design		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p><b>Cont.</b> It is a feature of Conservation Areas that their architectural 'style' invariably impacts on relatively adjacent buildings such change from being inside to that of outside a Conservation Area is gradual. From the point of view of the setting of Listed Buildings, whether within or without a Conservation Area, this is also considered to be important in ensuring a gradual change between Listed and non-Listed status is maintained.</p> <p>The current use of these listed buildings is well established as it is in those non-listed buildings in their immediate surroundings. Consequently, it is considered that the draft NP proposed 'primary' frontage should be extended on the western side of the High Street to include these listed buildings so maintaining a greater degree of control over their use and setting as well as the use of their immediate neighbouring buildings to ensure their character and setting of these listed buildings is not harmed in the future.</p>	<p>Agree setting of listed buildings is important but is protected by existing planning policy.</p>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> In that response comment was also made that the Council considers their Policy P16 in the 2013 Local Plan is supported by their use of the Appraisal relevant to the NPPF. This statement could be challenged in that at times, such support is withdrawn when the Council feel that its relevance is inappropriate! Whilst acknowledging the lack, or even potential source, of funding for the production of such a plan or the preparation of an up-dated Local List at this time, it is consequently considered the draft NP should include such references of the requirement of a Management Plan being prepared to relate to both Conservation Areas of Knowle and Dorridge and perhaps, if found acceptable, as a Policy which would permit this work be undertaken without the need for anything more than relevant consultation with the Council.</p>	<p>These comments require clarification. The Conservation Management Plan is included as a Community Action.</p>	

Traffic and Transport		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE AT LAUNCH OF DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 25/11/17</b>		
2 - Need more parking for station / church in Manor Rd. Congestion is b???? business can't park for work. Rail commuters happy to pay Sainsburys fine as cheaper than car park costs.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
4 - T9 Need provision for electric charging points on all new developments and public parking.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
5 - T6 Recent conversation has indicated that on the new Miller homes development cannot safely walk with her baby buggy. T9 Liaise with transport companies to ensure that transport bus and train meet to provide a linked service.	Agreed - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
6 - Links from Dorridge Station are essential. More information to link all public transport. Traffic Slow Speed to 20 mph on Station Road.	Agreed - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
7 - Parking is the most important issue - especially for the primary schools.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
12 - Disagree with proposals for reserved parking for electric cars to charge - I think it should be less.	This view is in the minority	
16 - Y Traffic lights at Lodge Rd Warwick Rd	Noted although there is also strong opinion that Traffic lights are at odds with Village character so other junction improvements might be more suitable	Y
23 - Dorridge station - agree parking for commuters - park and ride or multi storey at station car park. Totally agree re appropriate off street parking for housing / apartments.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
24 - More houses great need for more infrastructure.	Noted. No action.	
28 - Why not have a circular service operating via Solihull, Widney Manor, Dorridge, Knowle, Solihull, this would enhance and maintain the regularity of the service. This was the original route when I came into the area.	Agreed - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
30 - Junction at Grove Road / Warwick Road. With the building of Arden Triangle, this will create more traffic in this area and it currently queues up Grove Road at peak times. More and more people are commuting from our area and Monkspath, driving towards Warwick eg JLR workforce to Gaydon which shows now at peak times / rush hour the queues from Hatton Hall into Warwick. I therefore think this junction requires more attention as it is a pinchpoint in our road infrastructure. In respect of bus services, there needs to be a more reliable franchise for Dorridge residents (S2 route) as the buses are either taken off to be used on other routes during the day or break down.	This is the only comment that relates to this particular junction in the feedback. Policy Y does already identify Grove Road and Warwick Road as significant local roads. So no plan update is thought necessary. Transport improvements are also noted in the plan as Community actions.	
31 - Infrastructure of the roads cannot cope with increased traffic. More walking and cycling routes - giving priority to those using over cars!	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
33 - The bottom line is space. We all want more room / space but we are an island. The road network can not cope already. There is no easy answer. A lot of people are lazy and the car is king (sorry). The cycling is too dangerous. Drivers need to be educated.	Noted. No action.	
36 - If we want local business and local prosperity, we must provide either parking or a decent park and ride. We need an airport bus.	Agreed - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
37 - T2 There can be no increase in street parking in St Johns Close, in fact KDBHNF should be looking for ways to improve congestion and parking in this area. T3 It is important to locate charging points for electric vehicles in an area which will not be vandalised, and where there is some supervision. T7 Existing cycle paths are not continuous and therefore need review. Y Existing car park access/egress in Knowle is ignored and should be reinforced at Tesco!	Agreed and many points already covered in the plan - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
38 - T1 residents parking permits? T3 Rail Users - Not enough	Agree. Already in Plan - see community actions. No further plan update required.	
41 - Ticketed parking has helped retail but what about local residents eg flats. Should residents permits be introduced? Lining of roads like Milverton - not safe given Arden exit for children.	Agree. Already in Plan - see community actions. No further plan update required.	
42 - I would like to see the island 'refuges' put back in central Dorridge eg. Avenue Road, Forest Road, Poplar Road. I now find crossing these roads quite hazardous. Being able to cross in two stages is much safer.	Noted. Already in Plan - see community actions. No further plan update required.	
45 - Cycle routes needed - proper ones physically separated from roads (paint is not sufficient!). Cycle access through Knowle Park. Zebra crossing at junction of Mill Lane / Widney Road - v dangerous.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
46 - Commuter cars a problem and waiting for ?? ?? accident - Poplar Road, Dorridge. More off road / walkers access to countryside south of Dorridge Park.	Noted. Already in Plan - see community actions. No further plan update required.	
47 - T3 Minimum 5% too low for electric. Needs to be 20-25% to be consistent with future goals for electric vehicles. T4 All developers need to contribute to infrastructure of village S106/S278. T5 There is never 'no significant impact' of large developments !! T7 Imperative to provide segregated cycle lanes to encourage increased usage. Look at Copenhagen! Y Increased development generates traffic. Reinstatement of the Knowle Bypass Route (REF 125) should be seriously considered but with cycling and walking and traffic calming featuring in its design. It was madness to drop it from plans when considering developments such as Arden Triangle. How will people get access?! Lodge Road and High Street ?!	All points are noted and many covered in the plan. Electric charging point numbers may need to increase in the plan. Lodge road and Bypass mentions support more definitive mention in the plan for one way system evaluation at least.	Y
48 - Parking is a problem NOW what would 1000+ houses do to improve this? Congestion in the roads around St Johns Close due to on-street parking is a real problem. The re-configuration of some of the green areas with better footpaths would help. Paying for car park at Dorridge Station should be easier.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
49 - More off street parking needed. 4 Bed houses could have 5+ cars.	Noted - We believe the plan proposal for off-street parking is a reasonable assessment of the evidence we have from survey and residents' views.	
50 - Multi Storey behind Sainsburys Petrol Station. No new building permission until 2 parking places per property.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
51 - The circle of green space (with trees etc) is of course a very valuable amenity for residents of St Johns Close and should be safeguarded. However, in my opinion, it is unnecessarily large, and could be reduced in circumference to produce much needed parking space for local workers and businesses, visitors to the villagem and shoppers that already struggle to find a parking space. Car ownership is a fact of life, and further housing development produces more pressure on parking spaces.	This view is in the minority. Although St Johns close is a known issue, there is also strong opinion from many wishing to preserve it as a green space.	
55 - Unfortunately, due to the profile of the area or maybe more importantly the profile of those who respond to surveys, debate is dominated with parking. People should be encouraged to walk more. That said, needs balancing with encouraging people from outside to shop and work here. Dorridge station needs more parking.	Noted. No action.	
57 - Provision for Residents Parking in Station road at a reasonable cost for pensioners and 1 parent parking. Ensure businesses take responsibility for the parking for their staff and customers without impacting on local residents.	Noted. No action. See community actions	

Traffic and Transport		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
58 - How will the infrastructure / electricity supplier support the growing number of electric cars needing to be charged? Will the growth in numbers of cars being charged at any one time affect the householders electricity supply?	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
61 - Cycling infrastructure linked up to other towns / villages ie end to end provision.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
62 - Please Avoid making Milverton a through road. T7 Major consideration - if we want our children to remain fit and safe we must be able to rely on safe cycle routes - physically separate from road traffic (not just a white line) - look at Denmark. Y Please add Station Road / Warwick Road junction - very dangerous for 10/11 year olds walking to primary school.	Noted. Already in Plan - see community actions. No further plan update required.	
63 - T10 ?meaning diesel fumes?	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
65 - Lodge Road. Buses have great difficulty - No Parking.	Agree. Already in Plan to some extent. Supports one-way system evaluation.	Y
66 - Infrastructure will need to improve with any new housing development. Very poor at present? Parking, Drainage, Schools, Doctors, all struggling to cope at present.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
71 - Realistically people won't cycle in large numbers, and everyone will drive, and most work outside Knowle. The plan needs to highlight this as a major issue.	Agree. Already in Plan. This is the dilemma - Cycling will only increase with more safe cycle routes - hence T7	
78 - I am concerned that current roads will be unable to cope with any increased housing etc. More thought needs to be given to cyclists demands, the current cycle lane along the Warwick Road at Copt Heath is a dangerous step backwards for drivers! PS I am a cyclist. We should encourage cyclists to use the myriad of lanes in the area not foul up the main roads!	Agree. Already in Plan. This is the dilemma - Cycling will only increase with more safe cycle routes - hence T7	
79 - Sort the parking before you build more houses, 1000 houses is 2000 more cars. Why no houses in Dorridge.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
81 - Dorridge station needs staff there all day. It is often unmanned.	Noted. No action.	
82 - Parking is dire! Improve no of spaces please - not by restricting length of parking. Leisure facilities also need space for parking not just shops!	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
83 - Yes to Policies. But a couple of points - public transport is generally OK, but have to get people to use it. Difficult, but policies have to discourage car use. Should Solihull Station with better parking be the main hub for high speed trains; not popular but reduces car parking around Dorridge.	Agree - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
89 - T6 The footpaths outside house frontages must be contiguous. If these absolutely have to break across the road a pedestrian crossing should be provided. Y These assessments need to be more rigorous. T9 Existing public transport is completely inadequate.	Agreed - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions. Regarding footways, this is covered in T6	
91 - Knowle would benefit from having a one way system through the village, Station Road leading to Lodge Road.	Agree - Plan may need to be more specific on this	Y
96 - T9 My main concern is public transport being available for elderly residents, at the moment to get from Bentley Heath into Knowle you have to get a bus to Dorridge, then another from the station to Knowle. Bentley Heath needs a Knowle bus keeping vehs. off roads if only 1 per hour. Visiting Knowle village for its variety of shops and activities there would be an all round winner.	Agreed - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
97 - More people could walk.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
99 - This village is going to be destroyed. Why have housing this side of the M42 when all commuter will have to go through Knowle to reach it.	Noted. This comment supports the argument for more free flow of traffic through Knowle	Y
102 - Suggest no parking in Lodge Road - buses have difficulty. Or move bus route - but to where?	Agreed - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions. The lodge road issue is evidence that a one-way proposal should be evaluated.	Y
108 - Reflect in the plans how we are likely to move around in 2025. Might be rather different to today. Expand safe ways to walk and cycle. Find a transport hub parking magic bullet!	Agree. Already in Plan or Community actions. No further plan update required.	
111 - The certainly needs to be provision for more parking in Knowle and in Dorridge. There is little parking at Dorridge Station. The roundabout by the station needs to be reinstated as this is now a difficult junction.	Agreed - and see Y	
112 - T7 Maintain 20mph zone between Knowle and Dorridge centres. T9 Multistorey parking is required for Dorridge station (behind garage at station).	Agree. Already in Plan or Community actions. No further plan update required.	
114 - The only relevant issue is car parking. Put a compulsory purchase order on the football club in Hampton Road and problem is solved!	Noted. Compulsory purchase orders are out of scope for KDBH NP.	
116 - Proposals sound brilliant but how they are implemented will surely be more tricky. Wholly agree something must be done about horrendous street parking. Dorridge needs a multi-storey / basement car park behind St Philips (station car park, paying). Knowle is desperate - it has to have same provision ... park and ride? a multistorey somewhere?	Agree. Already in Plan or Community actions. No further plan update required.	
123 - More cycle routes for children to safely get to school / around village must be a priority for future.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
126 - Will it be gridlock 24/7 !	Noted. No action.	
127 - T2 Need to be mindful this does not use green space. Locals should walk (more healthy). T3 Locals should be encouraged to walk to shops, station etc - providing more parking just creates more car users. Improve bus services to get to the station from outlying areas eg Knowle, Bentley Heath, Four Ashes.	Agree - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
135 - How will T1 be achieved if it is contrary to the parking standards in the Local Plan?	Noted but at this stage we do not consider these are at odds with the local plan	
137 - Station approach roundabout essential - dedicated taxi drop off essential. Need to do much more to encourage and promote cycling (and walking).	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
142 - T3 Parking in Dorridge for station a continual controversy, eg constant anger at Poplar Road parking. Anything that would make this worse should be resisted. T9 would love a better bus service eg. post 6pm and weekends to reduce reliance on cars.	Agreed - Parking is already noted in the plan. Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
145 - Focus on improving public transport and provision of car parking at Dorridge station / reduce cost of parking at long stay car park to deter passengers from parking on local roads and causing traffic flow issues.	Agree - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
148 - Keep Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath as rural as possible.	Noted. No action.	
149 - General agreement with KDBH proposals.	Noted. No action.	
153 - T5 Massive increase in traffic through Knowle village from new houses development - how will we cope?	Noted. And supports the argument for more free flow of traffic through Knowle	Y
155 - Parking for both school and the village should be at the top of Stripes Hill where the fields are now. 1500-2000 parking spaces shared by School needs and shoppers needs. Build new school adjacent to this.	Agree. Already in Plan see T4. No further plan update required.	
156 - Much better public transport should be provided plus cycling and walking paths to reduce the need for the use of polluting and accidents causing cars.	Agreed - Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
158 - Rail user parking on Avenue Road is potentially unsafe.	Noted - Parking improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	

Traffic and Transport		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
160 - the addition of 300 + 750 new homes could add 2000 cars to the morning / evening rush-hour. A one-way system or relief road should be a pre-requisite to any development.	Agreed. Supports the argument for more free flow of traffic through Knowle	Y
161 - Restrict parking on Grange Road / Station Road in Dorridge. Strongly agree re parking for Dorridge station and short stay parking and redesign of junction by station. Gate Lane cd be one way? (with Box Trees Road?)	Noted - Parking improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions.	
162 - T1 Any and all street parking must be on the understanding that it does not mean parking on pavements! T3 All very well, but where? Also 5% charging bays much too small, needs to be 50% by 2033. T7 Ensure cycling prohibition is reinforced in Knowle Park. T10 see T3.	Comment on T1 Agreed. T3 Noted - this is the problem. Charging percentage we may need to amend the plan since there is plenty of other feedback suggesting this. T7 cycling prohibition in Knowle park - this is a minority view others would like to see an interconnecting cycle path through the park as per T7	Y
163 - Transport Assessments are vital. The number of houses allowed to be built on Arden triangle should be proportional to the capacity of traffic on Widney Road, Station Road and Knowle High Street, and Gate Lane.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
<b>MENTIMETER</b>		
T3: need more here. Provision of highdensity parking (eg multi-storey)for rail station (& reasonable/minimal charges) to encourage use.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
T3: I would have higher % elec charging points - elec cars are coming in fast...	Electric charging point numbers may need to increase in the plan.	Y
Y: Also note comment in 7.3 about poss impact of traffic lights etc on queues/pollution etc	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
Safe cycling routes around the village, properly separated from cars will offer residents real alternatives to driving.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
Unfortunately white lines on busy roads are not safe cycling routes for adults and especially for children	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
No real policy for the development of public transport initiatives - not imaginative or stretching enough to really change attitudes.	Noted. But this is out of scope for KDBH NP. Transport improvements are noted in the plan as Community actions	
Very well thought out.	Noted - thank you.	
T5- transport assessments, in relation to reducing car use, must be realistic T6 - no footways in a proposal is unacceptable.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
Plan needs to address the excessive driving speeds on long straight roads, e.g., Avenue Road, Lady Byron Road and Station Road.	Agree. Already in Plan - see community actions. No further plan update required.	
I strongly support moves to provide more parking, particularly at Dorridge station and around St John's Close.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
Difficulty at St John's Close is lack of all-day parking for local workers. Steps to prevent their use of car parks could make things worse.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further plan update required.	
The cycle route need a stronger priority make use of existing roads reduce speed rather than addition cycle path which will not be used	Agree with speed comments which are covered in community actions. Cycle path comment is in the minority. Without increasing the number of safe cycle paths across the board cycling will not increase. If they (cycle paths) are provided they will be used.	
Its essential for residents around Dorridge Road and Clyde Road to have the overdue parking restriction introduced prior to implementation.	Covered in community actions. No further plan update required.	
Over the past 20 years parking on Dorridge Road at the Clyde Road junction is ridiculous with rail user "none resident " parking .	Covered in community actions. No further plan update required.	
Why Should Dorridge residents for many years suffer the problems caused by none resident rail users parking in Clyde Road Dorridge Road ?	Covered in community actions. No further plan update required.	
Ref T1: On-street parking serves to slow traffic, increasing safety.e.g. Compare day & night speeds on Station rd.T1 overlooks this benefit.	Noted but this view is in a minority.	
T2: St John's Close,take small strip from green, make loop 1 way,park both sides & provide permits to staff of established shops/businesses	Noted - St John's close is already noted in the Plan	
Allocated electric vehicle bays must NOT be at the expense of bays for other vehicles.	Agreed - The plan does not intend to stipulate dedicated parking bays. Moving cyclists to pavements and off the road is outside the scope of the plan.	
Keep cyclists off roads onto shared pavements.		
Beware of creating new parking spaces that will encourage vehicles from outside the area to long term park.	Noted - but the purpose of long term parking might be to accommodate people working in the villages who commute from outside the area. If you live in the area then commuting distances are shorter and walking or cycling are possible alternatives for some. Good / bad parking examples is outside the scope of the plan.	
Include egs of good/badparking.		
Village staff parking a big problem. Dedicated parking on village outskirts with transport links, lockers for bikes etc?	Noted. Policy T4 is trying to address this.	
As well as providing cycle routes there should be better provision for pedestrians, such as zebra crossings, to help kids walking to school.	Noted. Already in community actions. No further plan update required.	
I would like to see the narrow parcel of land by Winchwood Ave used paved with grass crete and used for out of town parking which we need	Noted. Policy T4 is trying to address this.	
The focus on parking provision seems unsustainable and not in keeping with national policy. Providing parking encourages driving.	Noted - but this is a minority view and the vast majority of views indicate that Parking IS a major issue. Parking will not be an issue for those that do not drive so they can exercise that choice on a journey by journey basis.	
Off-road parking, priority should be given to the requirements of the local residents. Include impact on M42 congestion & pollution.	Noted. Already in community actions. No further plan update required.	
I still like provision of one parking place per bedroom.	Agreed - but that may be too restrictive and against national guidelines. Hence the more conciliatory wording in T1	
Generally approve although I think the provision of parking on new developments T1 encourages car ownership and subsequent use of vehicles.	Noted - but evidence of recent developments where there is little on site parking does not seem to support the view that car ownership is discouraged. Residents simply park on street.	
I do not feel that all housing should have parking spaces . What is the incentive to use public transport. Can use shared visitor parking.	Noted - and policies do allow for exceptions where the target end-users of the accommodation would not require high levels of parking provision.	
I think the two allocated car parking if two or more bedrooms is rather presumptuous if there is lack of space for building.	Noted - but good design can mitigate the requirement for space.	
<b>VIA WEBSITE</b>		

Traffic and Transport		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p>The proposed School site should be reviewed. By burying the school in the middle of the proposed housing development it will cause traffic chaos as developers tend to build narrow roads on housing estates. A road 1 1/2 times the width of Station Road is needed to feed the school where proposed as Station Road now gets clogged up with traffic between 8.00 - 8.50am and between 3.00-4.00pm. In addition it is proposed that children will use the bridle path to walk to the school. There is a massive Health &amp; Safety issue with that in that there are between 80 - 100 vehicle movements along this route daily. Some of these being large lorries, long well based vans as well as cars making the bridle path unsuitable for hundreds of children. To date even single pedestrians have to step onto very narrow grass verges to avoid this existing traffic. A more realistic site for the School would be on the Warwick Road at the top of Stripes Hill with a 1500 - 2000 car park space immediately behind the houses in Milverton Road with a new school adjacent to it. This car park not only will allow staff, pupils &amp; parents to park but would also increase parking facilities for Knowle shoppers. This site is only about 300 metres to the shops on Station Road (less than a 5 minute walk). Then the new Estate of houses will not be clogged by school traffic, particularly on Open Evenings, Prom Nights or ordinary everyday school traffic. I believe whatever SMBC approve this would be a more realistic way of accommodating the needs of Knowle for the long term.</p>	<p>This response is really related to Solihull's draft local plan where an allocation for the Arden triangle is proposed. The draft KDBH neighbourhood plan does not make any site specific recommendations. Policies are generic in the neighbourhood plan. That said, the suggestion to allocate some portion of the site to long stay parking is entirely consistent with policy T4.</p>	
<p>Subject School Site &amp; Car Parking            Message The proposed School site should be reviewed. By burying the school in the middle of the proposed housing development it will cause traffic chaos as developers tend to build narrow roads on housing estates. A road 1 1/2 times the width of Station Road is needed to feed the school where proposed as Station Road now gets clogged up with traffic between 8.00 - 8.50am and between 3.00-4.00pm. In addition it is proposed that children will use the bridle path to walk to the school. There is a massive Health &amp; Safety issue with that in that there are between 80 - 100 vehicle movements along this route daily. Some of these being large lorries, long well based vans as well as cars making the bridle path unsuitable for hundreds of children. To date even single pedestrians have to step onto very narrow grass verges to avoid this existing traffic. A more realistic site for the School would be on the Warwick Road at the top of Stripes Hill with a 1500 - 2000 car park space immediately behind the houses in Milverton Road with a new school adjacent to it. This car park not only will allow staff, pupils &amp; parents to park but would also increase parking facilities for Knowle shoppers. This site is only about 300 metres to the shops on Station Road (less than a 5 minute walk). Then the new Estate of houses will not be clogged by school traffic, particularly on Open Evenings, Prom Nights or ordinary everyday school traffic. I believe whatever SMBC approve this would be a more realistic way of accommodating the needs of Knowle for the long term.</p>	<p>This response is really related to Solihull's draft local plan where an allocation for the Arden triangle is proposed. The draft KDBH neighbourhood plan does not make any site specific recommendations. Policies are generic in the neighbourhood plan. That said, the suggestion to allocate some portion of the site to long stay parking is entirely consistent with policy T4.</p>	
<p>I support the need for additional car parking at Dorridge Station. Commuters cars are causing dangerous parking on the surrounding roads.</p>	<p>Agree. Already in Plan or Community actions. No further plan update required.</p>	
<p>I am concerned at the plan's intention to reduce on-street parking. Whilst this may be possibly warranted in very specific areas (although none immediately come to mind), in general cars parked on the main routes indicated on the plan (Widney Road, Station Road, Lodge Road etc) serve to reduce traffic speeds through the villages, especially at times of peak pedestrian activity. Attempts to slow traffic by other means (e.g. speed bumps on Station Road, Widney Road, Lodge Road) have only been partially effective, as witnessed by traffic speeds in the evenings etc where fewer parked cars means speeds increase, often in excess of the stated limits. On balance I believe that the short term and limited inconvenience of slightly slower journeys through the village due to parked cars is an acceptable price to pay for overall slower traffic speeds and greater safety, especially of children and the elderly.</p>	<p>The comment is noted, however it is a minority view. The residents survey and other feedback suggest that most residents would prefer the public highways to be clear and used for moving traffic as opposed to them being used as car parks. The policy T1 is aimed at new developments and is aimed at preventing developers from failing to provide adequate parking for the residents of their developments, thereby shifting the problem onto the public highways and thus inconveniencing other road users.</p>	
<p>T3: more electric vehicles should be encouraged above 5% in terms of spaces.            T4: What in this proposal is new - again, surely this is current SMBC policy?            T4: This proposal for "provisions" to be made as part of any major development to deal with "unacceptable conditions regarding traffic" in my opinion simply assumes that any increase in people / journeys related to new housing developments can be planned away. Whether this unconstrained development will be successful is not discussed, nor sufficient detail included of what specific measures (provisions) will be required. Without this it is difficult for residents / reviewers to disagree with these document aims - as they cannot assess the practical impacts of each policy.            T7: It is noteworthy that only in this section is there a specific example given to better explain / demonstrate the policy (extension of existing cycle lane). Shouldn't more concrete examples be listed or policies be more precisely worded throughout this document, following this example - in order to give reviewers / residents something concrete to agree or disagree with?            Y: This policy in particular would benefit from some more detailed specification - as a basis to get agreement / consensus. It is very difficult to disagree with a statement saying there should be "proposals for .. improvement".            T9 - see comments re Y</p>	<p>The comment relation to electric vehicle spaces is noted and we may need to amend the policy since there is a lot of consistent feedback on this issue. T4 - No we do not believe there is any evidence to suggest that this is Solihull's policy. The draft local plan had no evidence of the authority following such a policy. An aim of T4 policy is to ensure that a development is not permitted to proceed if it exacerbates congestion and parking issues which have already been established as problematic. To allow that to happen would clearly be totally illogical. Therefore such developments should at least contribute to a solution that as a bare minimum prevents any worsening of the situation. The policy is generic, it is not aimed at any particular proposals. This does not seem an unreasonable. T7 - The only specific proposal that has been voiced is the one quoted. Y Specific proposals may come through community actions as noted in the plan document. The only other specific proposal that has gathered momentum is for one way system within Knowle. Community actions can bring these individually to the attention of the authority</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p><b>VIA LIBRARY</b></p>		
<p>With the high percentage already of 2 car families and also the residential merge of Knowle, Dorridge and BH, the available space for improvement is already at a premium. Therefore, while needed already, major infrastructure changes must be limited. Further residential development will not help the cause.</p>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	
<p>With so many houses parking will become a nightmare - again! The present cycling lanes render roads too narrow for other transport and seemingly very few cyclists use them. Public transport need to be plentiful and reliable.</p>	<p>Agree. Already in Plan - see community actions. No further plan update required.</p>	
<p>With 500 - 750 new homes planned where will they park when they do their shopping? Does the usage of cycle lanes justify the effort on cycling infrastructure? Not enough local buses.</p>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	
<p>Pavement parking is not allowed in Middlefield but it is challenging when residents have workers on site or visitors. Most homes have only have 1-2 drive spaces and are 2 car households. Some towns like Chester offer reasonable resident parking on the roads, £10 per month in central areas with no off street parking. Also for workers in locality. Footpath infrastructure in Middlefield is restricted on some roads making it challenging with a buggy some days! Need greater amount of buses. I use rail but would use buses more if more frequent. I know of parents driving kids to St Peters as no bus service anymore.</p>	<p>This feedback seems to encapsulate why policies T1 and T6 are necessary. Transport improvements are identified as community actions in the plan document.</p>	
<p>5 bed houses need 5 parking spaces</p>	<p>Agreed - but that may be too restrictive and against national guidelines. Hence the more conciliatory wording in T1</p>	

<b>Traffic and Transport</b>		Action Taken
<b>Source / Comment</b>	<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	
<p>I feel very strongly that some roads i.e.Warwick Road from Knowle Village to M42, are excessively busy from 6:30 to 9:30 and 15:15 to 18:30 weekdays and 10:00 to 17:00 weekends. A further development of 500 - 1050 new dwellings in the Plan area will result in 1500 - 3000 more vehicles, the majority using the Warwick Road to access the M42 or Solihull/Birmingham. No mention is made of effective pollution control measures for protecting those residents who dogedly endeavour to walk/cycle/jog to school/work or even just to keep reasonably fit. The draft area Plan for KDBH is concentrating too many new dwellings on the A4141 corridor. I object to that!</p>	<p>This issue is really related to Solihull's draft local plan.</p>	

Traffic and Transport		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>SMBC</b>		
<p>Transport</p> <p>1.41 Overall it is considered that more impetus should be given to the use and promotion of public transport. At present, the balance is still being skewed towards accommodating travel by private car. Moreover, a number of policies are quite specific in their requirements (e.g. parking requirements; distances from village centres) and it is unclear whether there is evidence to support these specific requirements. If not, they could be viewed as relatively arbitrary and open to challenge.</p>	<p>The scope of the plan policies are limited to land use so it is not clear how the document can really address the use of public transport beyond the community actions which are already identified. The balance reflects residents views and it is clear that private car ownership needs to be accommodated. Given that the draft local plan foresees significant increases in employment opportunities in the north of the borough whilst promoting more housing in KDBH, but has no suggestion for the implementation of any public transport between the two, it is clear that travel by private car will persist. In addition, the proposed development sites are not on regular (or any) bus routes, so policies must be realistic. There is ample evidence in the residents' survey (should any examiner wish to read it) and indeed other feedback to the draft local plan that there are requirements to improve parking capacity in every one of the village centres. The availability of sites is an issue. Hence T4 suggests that if a site or part thereof has become available within reasonable proximity to a village centre then that represents an ideal opportunity to increase parking capacity. At the time of writing we await the findings of the authority's transport and parking surveys which have yet to be released. If they provide incontrovertible contradictory evidence then the policy may be revisited.</p>	
<p>Policy T1: Parking for Residents</p> <p>1.42 It is considered that specifying a number of parking spaces that relates to the number of bedrooms is at odds with the Council's (and NPPF) policy that an evidence-led approach should be taken in determining both resident and visitor parking provision. For example, the evidence-led approach to parking provision should be considered in relation to public transport accessibility and public transport improvements proposed in association with the development.</p> <p>1.43 There also seems to be contradiction in the policy, as it also suggests that appropriate parking provision should be made, but that an evidence-led approach should be taken when the specific parking requirements cannot be achieved. Most developers would see the provision of parking spaces as specified by the policy as being an inefficient use of land and it is therefore expected that an evidence-based approach would be pursued by them in any event.</p>	<p>The T1 policy may be more prescriptive than the Council's policy but that is the prerogative of a neighbourhood plan. The existing council policy (or at least its application) has clearly been ineffectual when applied to recent developments in the KDBH area. In the event that there were, hypothetically, some transport improvements associated with a development it would seem impractical to ensure a hard link that would guarantee they remain in place, so that argument is not accepted. Having said that, the policy will be adjusted to better reflect NPPF. The mention of an evidence based approach is on reflection a contradiction so this can be removed from the policy. We do not accept the suggestion that developers would see the policy as an inefficient use of land. It remains in their gift to be imaginative in their designs. Other aspects of NPPF seem to already be taken into account. ● the accessibility of the development; (policy is applied on a case by case basis) ● the type, mix and use of development; (provision depends on mix and purpose) ● the availability of and opportunities for public transport; (as noted the policy will be amended) ● local car ownership levels; (are high and reflect the demographics and typical journeys necessary when living in the KDBH area - the policy reflects this) ● an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles. (not necessarily addressed in this policy but is in T4).</p>	Y
<p>Policy T2: Parking for Non-Residential Premises</p> <p>1.44 Whilst it is stated that St John's Close is an area of particular parking stress and congestion, it is considered that a policy of not allowing proposals that are likely to result in additional on-street parking in St Johns Close, would be difficult to apply. Similarly, if a development were permitted on the basis that it is unlikely to generate such parking, how would it be enforced if parking on St John's Close were then to occur? It is considered that outlining the specific sensitivities of St John's Close may be more appropriate.</p>	<p>Via the resident's survey and every feedback opportunity provided to residents, St John's close is highlighted as a specific street that suffers from parking stress and congestion. That is the rationale for special mention in the plan. Given that it is already at maximum capacity it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that further demand should be avoided. Policy T4 offers an opportunity to increase capacity, certainly to the extent that issues are not exacerbated.</p>	
<p>Policy Y: Road Infrastructure</p> <p>1.45 The policy references a number of 'major roads' and requires that development having access from these roads shall include measures to ensure the safety and flow of traffic. However, in terms of road hierarchy, many of these roads would not be classed as 'major'; they are more of local importance. More importantly, it is expected that appropriate measures to ensure the safety and free flow of traffic is not compromised by any development, irrespective of its location and / or the road from which access is taken.</p>	<p>The policy can be amended to redefine "major roads" as "roads of local importance". If this is already taken into account there will be no objection to this being re-iterated as a Neighbourhood Plan policy.</p>	Y
<b>OFFICIAL CONSULTEES</b>		
<p>Thank you for forwarding me the details of the Knowle, Dorridge &amp; Bentley Heath Neighbourhood Plan. We welcome the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan and have reviewed it in the context of the Strategic Road Network (SRN). <b>Highways England</b> has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth. The SRN within the vicinity of Knowle, Dorridge and Bentley Heath comprises the M42 Motorway including Junctions 4 and 5. Motorway including Junctions 4 and 5. Following our review of your draft Plan, we note that a significant level of residential development is proposed, including sites previously allocated by the Solihull Local Plan (2013) which has since been partially quashed. The traffic implications of this level of development and any new sites proposed through the ongoing Solihull Local Plan Review process may have implications for our network. As these issues were considered by the previous version of the Local Plan and will be considered again within the Local Plan Review, we are content that there is no need for the Neighbourhood Plan to consider these matters directly. Nonetheless, we recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan should make reference to proposed development within the Plan area as having potential traffic implications for the SRN. This should be assessed via the Solihull Local Plan Review process and at the point any planning application is submitted through the provision of a suitable Transport Assessment.</p>	<p>Noted: No action needed in terms of changes to the plan.</p>	
<p><b>THE KNOWLE SOCIETY.</b> Many recent non-retail planning applications considered by KS's planning committee within the Conservation Area has seen reliance being made of the provision of car parking which, if not included within the application area itself, relies on existing public parking spaces. Unfortunately the cumulative effect of these applications could result in a shortage of parking spaces at peak times. Consequently, it is suggested that the NP includes at the very least, a recommendation, if not a Policy, that the cumulative effect of non-retail planning applications be taken into consideration as part of the decision-making process.</p>	<p>Noted. Adequately covered by Policy T2.</p>	

<b>Traffic and Transport</b>		Action Taken
<b>Source / Comment</b>	<b>Responses from KDBH - NF</b>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> Many recent non-retail planning applications considered by KS's planning committee within the Conservation Area has seen reliance being made of the provision of car parking which, if not included within the application area itself, relies on existing public parking spaces. Unfortunately the cumulative effect of these applications could result in a shortage of parking spaces at peak times. Consequently, it is suggested that the NP includes at the very least, a recommendation, if not a Policy, that the cumulative effect of non-retail planning applications be taken into consideration as part of the decision-making process .</p>	<p>Covered by transport and parking policies. Each must be assessed on its merits. Travel Plans required in some instances.</p>	

Education and Community Facilities		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE AT LAUNCH OF DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 25/11/17</b>		
2 - Education is being used as a scapegoat for Council to get what they want. 1300 houses in exchange for a school and thats only one area of development (Rotten Row).	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
6 - Maintain local school but improve pick up points.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Policy ECF2	
7 - ECF1 Local is the watchword !!	Noted. No action.	
23 - ECF4 Additional Doctors / Surgery required / essential if another 500 / 1000 houses proposed.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Addressed in supporting text to ECF4	
24 - Education was excellent. There is a need for it to continue. Not sufficient facilities for extra pupils.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
31 - The school is huge now - it will increase even more - will the numbers be manageable? Should an additional school be built?	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
37 - ECF1&2 I do not agree that Arden Academy should be allowed to increase school size without control. A 10 form entry school is clearly not ideal, and should be replaced by two schools which are independent (both 5 FE) with capacity to increase to 6 FE. Existing provision is overkill and should be regulated. There is no capacity to increase Nos at Arden.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
45 - 1k extra houses is way too many - infrastructure and environment not suitable.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
47 - Congestion should not be given lip service when considering developments. need to encourage cycling and walking to school and provide infrastructure to do so.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Policy ECF2	
48 - Local schools already under pressure 1000+ houses will not help.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
55 - Whilst agreeing with much reduced development, and would much rather the developments were north of KDBH, around Jn4 M42, we are where we are, and we need to ensure developers / solihull keep to their word and provide a modern and large enough school and sports facilities that we can rightly be proud of. But we'll end up with a half baked delivery if we don't keep pressing.	Noted. No action. Policies ECF2, ECF3, ECF4, ECF5 and ECF6 collectively address those elements of comment that are in scope	
60 - Please remember Catholic children only 30 places this side of M42 - top performing primary school for local children with a Catholic faith. 10% of children in new builds predicted to be Catholic please remember us!	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
61 - Encourage more cycling / walking to work and school.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Policy ECF2 plus transport policies	
62 - ECF3 Please remember the explosion in 'elderly' ie. over 65's - physical exercises specifically strength and balance have proven to reduce falls (1:3 >65s fall). This is to be provided in Norman Green but to be able to have this facility locally is a huge importance. ECF4 Please consider GP / Medical services - we need more detail and better provision for an ageing population.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Addressed in supporting text to ECF4 provided community places priority relative to other facilities going forward	
75 - There is no mention of Arden School been relocated and the new entrance etc.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
81 - Destination of Arden School?	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
83 - Agree with Policies.	Noted. No action.	
89 - There should be an addition policy for adult / life long learning. It is mentioned on the high level board but more detail policies needed.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Addressed in supporting text to ECF4 provided community places priority relative to other facilities going forward	
91 - Local children should automatically have places at local schools, parents having paid a premium to live here.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
99 - Why or why is the Academy taking more and more pupils from outside the area which creates massive traffic problems.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
103 - Places for schooling should be allocated for local children only.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
107 - New proposals must not effect provision for current local residents. Spot on.	Noted. No action.	
108 - Crucial issue given the expanding demographic. More places. Arden is stretched ad needs upgrading. Provision of childcare, nursery is very tight.	Noted. No action. ECF1 text mentions childcare	
110 - The existing secondary school is full to capacity already - there are 10 forms in each year! The school redevelopment needs to take place in advance of any new housing.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
111 - More provision is required for infant and junior schools as there is already a problem with getting children into desired school.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
119 - I agree that a new Arden School should be built and St George and Teresa School should be relocated to the new housing estate as its buildings are of poor quality and very little outdoor space currently.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
123 - Found this policy very unclear and confusing. What is happening to primary schools?	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
126 - I am really worried about how this will impact.	Noted. No action. Very general concern expressed	
134 - St George and St Teresa School needs to move site and become a two form entry primary school. On its present site it is unable to offer all the community facilities of extended school - 2 plus - 3 yr old education. Present site too restrictive. School is for local children not accessing facilities or other schools in the community.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
142 - Education Policy will need to take into account St George and St Teresa's ambition to move to 2 form entry and therefore expand.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
144 - Arden Academy's ambitions exceed the needs of the local population and are in danger of a negative impact.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	

Education and Community Facilities		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
145 - Whilst the idea of a new, improved Arden Academy is, on the face of it, a good idea - the impact on the community of the associated loss of green belt land must be taken into consideration. A new school will no doubt attract pupils from outside KDBH thus increasing traffic problems which will exacerbate increased traffic produced by large numbers of new houses.	Noted. No action. Some aspects addressed by ECF2	
149 - Concerned about the strain of substantial new developments on existing facilities.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
155 - Do not build new school buried in a housing estate which means all school traffic has to go through Estate. Build new school on Warwick Road on Stripes Hill.	Noted. No action.	
158 - People / families want to live here because of Arden School. It's vital the educational standard isn't dropped. Provision of facilities for young people to meet outside school hours, safely. It is noticeable that some lads and lasses congregate in Dorridge ??? unsupervised and unprotected.	Noted. No action. Policies ECF4 & 5 and supporting text relate to one aspect of the comment. Other aspects out of scope	
160 - Arden Academy is fine as it is. There is absolutely no need for a new school - it would be immensely wasteful to knock down the existing and build anew. Similarly St George / Teresa. Mr Murphys motives and links to the landowners of the Arden triangle should be examined and explained.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
162 - ECF1&2 Parking by parents Must be addressed for the current situation as well as any future enlargements.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
163 - Any new schools should have adequate footpaths for easy access. Paths should be well lit.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Policy ECF2 refers	
166 - I would like to see an alternative proposal to the 'Murphy Plan' to retain the current asset of £30m and build a second secondary school on the land available.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
<b>MENTIMETER</b>		
It is apparent that local school facilities do need upgrading if we are to continue to provide good learning environments for our children.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
ECF2-New schools should have a good proportion of playing fields/green spaces. Replacement schools eg new Arden should not reduce such space	Noted. No action. Policy ECF4, 5 & 6 provide a basis to get visibility for community when proposals submitted	
I support the policy	Noted. No action.	
ECF1 - new housing will initially impact on primary school pupil numbers, but will soon affect senior school numbers.	Noted. No action. Demographics are complex!	
ECF1 - new schools, in order to attract funding, must prioritise local pupils in their admission policies.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
ECF2 - where feasible schools to be located near community centre - not on the edge of the area, as this will encourage more vehicle use	Noted. No action. ECF2 states expected tests	
ECF4- community access is vital. A balance needs to be struck between having car parking and easy walking distance.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Believe addressed by ECF 5 & 6	
The location of new school focuses on drop of points etc. The plan should promote all students walking to school discourage use of cars	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
Need for more community facilities in particular sports facilities which could be provided by a new school should be included	Noted. No action. While out of scope for NP, policies ECF4, 5 & 6 provide a basis for community input and visibility	
A new Arden School should be focus of the community with new sports facility and community evening access	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
ECF6:My reading of(eg) Arden 2020 is that there is good clarity over nature of provisions;'no clarity' should be replaced by 'no certainty'	Noted. No action. Disagree with suggestion there is not good clarity at this point at overall or detailed level	
Continued reference to 'young and the elderly' seems superfluous since policy states 'all residents'. Why do NF need to highlight these?	Noted. No action. Reference reflects inputs from community in evidence base	
Now NF accepts needs for ca500 homes it needs to work more collaborative with (eg) Arden 2020 to ensure that maximises the benefits for the whole community otherwise private developers will profit with no benefits to KDBH residents with other recent developments.Has wider community benefited from recent Hampton Rd & High Street developments?	Noted. No action. Whilst part of comment out of scope for NP, ECF4, 5, 6 & 7 provide a basis for community input, prioritisation and visibility to enable effective input to planning process	
Emphasise giving first choice to local NDBH children.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
Priority should be to encourage children to walk or cycle to school, by providing safe walkways and cycle tracks to and from all schools.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Policy ECF2 addresses in scope aspect of this comment	
Add - Marketed at a reasonable/market price.	Assume comment relates to ECF3. The activity marketed will be qualified in supporting text	Y
Add - With parking and no disruption to traffic flow.	Noted. No action. Cannot understand the target of this comment	
Education is important for all and it is good to see we are looking to improve.	Noted. No action.	
need to ensure needs of existing children s schooling is addressed.		
We do not want increase in class sizes. Need to keep community feel.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
I am providing a response on behalf of the Knowle Allotment Society Committee. The value of Allotments to engender community engagement is not fully recognised in the policy as currently drafted. These green spaces provide both opportunity for active pursuit of outdoor activity and community engagement that can enhance the wellbeing of participants of all ages and the wider community. These valuable assets run by volunteers deserve a degree of protection and as such should be mentioned in the text below the policy item ECF 3.	Allotments will also be added	Y

Education and Community Facilities		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>VIA WEBSITE</b>		
<p>10.3 et seq Given known development proposals, a section on Enabling Development should be added setting out some established principles that need to be adopted inc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* scale of new community development to be minimum required to meet a demonstrable need</li> <li>* other options for funding demonstrably exhausted</li> <li>* balance between impact of enabling development and need for provision of community facilities addressed and favourable</li> </ul> <p>Subject School Site &amp; Car Parking</p>	<p>Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. Within the scope of planning processes/law and regulation ECF4, 5 &amp; 6 provide a mechanism to evaluate these considerations and prioritise available</p>	
<p>Message The proposed School site should be reviewed. By burying the school in the middle of the proposed housing development it will cause traffic chaos as developers tend to build narrow roads on housing estates. A road 1 1/2 times the width of Station Road is needed to feed the school where proposed as Station Road now gets clogged up with traffic between 8.00 - 8.50am and between 3.00-4.00pm. In addition it is proposed that children will use the bridle path to walk to the school. There is a massive Health &amp; Safety issue with that in that there are between 80 - 100 vehicle movements along this route daily. Some of these being large lorries, long well based vans as well as cars making the bridle path unsuitable for hundreds of children. To date even single pedestrians have to step onto very narrow grass verges to avoid this existing traffic. A more realistic site for the School would be on the Warwick Road at the top of Stripes Hill with a 1500 - 2000 car park space immediately behind the houses in Milverton Road with a new school adjacent to it. This car park not only will allow staff, pupils &amp; parents to park but would also increase parking facilities for Knowle shoppers. This site is only about 300 metres to the shops on Station Road (less than a 5 minute walk. Then the new Estate of houses will not be clogged by school traffic, particularly on Open Evenings, Prom Nights or ordinary everyday school traffic. I believe whatever SMBC approve this would be a more realistic way of accommodating the needs of Knowle for the long term.</p> <p>Education and Community Facilities</p> <p>I support all policies in Section 10</p> <p>I would also suggest that KDBH needs to actively support the need to improve the facilities in local schools. There are very dated and very facilities at Arden and local Primary schools. There has been very limited capital investment compared with all schools in the North of Solihull. The local infrastructure was not designed to support the existing number of students who attend the local schools – eg drainage, parking, access, cycle ways and footpaths.</p> <p>KDBH should be clearly stating how poor the community leisure facilities are eg no floodlit all weather facilities, very poor changing room space and limited space for community groups eg U3A</p> <p>KDBH should acknowledge that there is major community support for the project Arden 2020. The Arden 2020 Vision has been specifically developed to help address these issues and I look forward to working with you to turn this vision into reality for the good of the whole community.</p> <p>The vision to create a new state of the art educational facility with major new community facilities for young and old supports the vision, objectives and the vast majority of the published policies and goals of the Draft KDBH Neighbourhood Plan (6.1; 6.2; 6.3; 6.5; 6.6; 7.1; 7.3; 7.4; 7.5; 7.6; 7.7; 8.1; 8.2; 8.3; 9.1; 9.2; 9.3; 9.5; 9.6; 9.7; 9.8; 9.11; 10.1; 10.2; 10.3; 10.4; 10.5; 10.6; 10.7).</p>	<p>Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.</p>	
<p>I support the building of a new Arden School. As there is a requirement in the borough for new housing the exchange of the land where the school currently sits for the developers financial support to build a new school would seem to be a fantastic opportunity. This is also a good plan for the safety of children travelling to and from all the schools in the area. The amount of traffic in the area is increasing. Huge lorries travel up Station Road during the morning and evening school runs. Also I have noticed that as soon as there are problems on the M40 or M42 it significantly increases the amount of traffic coming through Knowle and Dorridge.</p>	<p>Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.</p>	
<p>ECF1 - in my online feedback I neither agreed nor disagreed here - I do not understand the policy aim from its wording currently!</p> <p>ECF2: Seems so generally worded as to be meaningless. I don't understand what it is aiming for - hence so far I can neither agree nor disagree?</p> <p>ECF3: I agree with one objective I see here, for developers to contribute to infrastructure supporting their developments and the wider community. I presume requiring developers to contribute is - again - already SMBC policy? An expectation to "create new facilities" in this way however seems to risk becoming wholly dependent on developer contributions. How can this therefore be a separate policy of the NP for new facilities - it is surely wholly dependent on the number of new housing developments as currently worded - otherwise new community facilities should be a separate topic and be separately funded.</p>	<p>Noted. No action. Most of the comments are out of scope for NP, however last part response is: ALL the policies in NP (across all sections) apply to new proposals - see section on target numbers</p>	

Education and Community Facilities		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>VIA LIBRARY</b>		
ECF3 - Have some concerns about the restrictive aspect of requiring a site/property to be actively marketed for a period of 12 months or more which may cause a slight problem to a small business owner of a commercial property who cannot continue in business for financial reasons. Such a policy needs care in its application.	Changes to supporting text made to reflect	Y
The idea of a new school to replace Arden Academy is highly desirable.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
Need to protect Catholic school places and ensure adequate places for residents. Playgrounds, dog walking etc. should be part of all developments. Many schools have new recreational sports facilities that are available to public in evenings and at weekends and make buildings self funding.	Noted. No action. Part out of scope for NP. However, ECF4 & 6 give framework for community to prioritise and have visibility of and proposals for community facilities	
The case for relocating Arden is not proven	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
Who is going to benefit most and the expense will be exceedingly high	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
With regard to schools it must be better economic option to further develop and extend than demolish and start again. The area is very important to balance out as it is essential to sustain and further develop the future of KDBH.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
<b>SMBC</b>		
Policy ECF4: New Housing Development – Investment in Community Facilities 1.46 It is perhaps better to 'support' new housing developments that will contribute to enhancing local community facilities to address the needs of new residents, as it cannot be expected that all new housing developments will make such a contribution. Policy ECF6: Community Access and Management	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. A previous version of this policy did use the word "support". At QA review this was modified to "welcome" to indicate a positive response but not require all individual proposals that meet the listed criteria to be supported irrespective of the actual detailed proposal.	
CONT. 1.47 The information that is required at the planning application stage is nationally prescribed and supplemented with local requirements. Community Access Statements are not a requirement for applications in Solihull and a planning application is unlikely to be refused in the absence of one. The Policy could certainly encourage the submission of a Community Access Statement, but it cannot require it.	The word "required" will be modified to "expected to be made available". It is accepted that if this expectation is not met then a planning application is unlikely to be refused on the basis of the absence of a CAS	Y
<b>OFFICIAL CONSULTEES</b>		
Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above neighbourhood plan. Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important. It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Parts 73 and 74. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's statutory consultee role in protecting playing fields and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport England's playing fields policy is set out in our Planning Policy Statement: 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of England'. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy">http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy</a>	Noted. No action. The comments and referenced NPPF and other documentation are considered valuable and useful in the context of the implementation of policies ECF4, 5 & 6 in the case of individual proposals, and particularly SMBC concept masterplanning activities. Current NP policies are believed to be compatible with the comments/referenced documents and no modification to the policies' text is considered necessary.	
Cont. Sport England provides guidance on developing planning policy for sport and further information can be found via the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/</a>	Noted. No action. The comments and referenced NPPF and other documentation are considered valuable and useful in the context of the implementation of policies ECF4, 5 & 6 in the case of individual proposals, and particularly SMBC concept masterplanning activities. Current NP policies are believed to be compatible with the comments/referenced documents and no modification to the policies' text is considered necessary.	
Cont. Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date evidence. In line with Part 74 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.	Noted. No action. The comments and referenced NPPF and other documentation are considered valuable and useful in the context of the implementation of policies ECF4, 5 & 6 in the case of individual proposals, and particularly SMBC concept masterplanning activities. Current NP policies are believed to be compatible with the comments/referenced documents and no modification to the policies' text is considered necessary.	
Cont. Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance">http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance</a>	Noted. No action. The comments and referenced NPPF and other documentation are considered valuable and useful in the context of the implementation of policies ECF4, 5 & 6 in the case of individual proposals, and particularly SMBC concept masterplanning activities. Current NP policies are believed to be compatible with the comments/referenced documents and no modification to the policies' text is considered necessary.	

Education and Community Facilities		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<p><b>Cont.</b> If new or improved sports facilities are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes. <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/</a></p>	<p>Noted. No action. The comments and referenced NPPF and other documentation are considered valuable and useful in the context of the implementation of policies ECF4, 5 &amp; 6 in the case of individual proposals, and particularly SMBC concept masterplanning activities. Current NP policies are believed to be compatible with the comments/ereferenced documents and no modification to the policies' text is considered necessary.</p>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> Any new housing developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.</p>	<p>Noted. No action. The comments and referenced NPPF and other documentation are considered valuable and useful in the context of the implementation of policies ECF4, 5 &amp; 6 in the case of individual proposals, and particularly SMBC concept masterplanning activities. Current NP policies are believed to be compatible with the comments/ereferenced documents and no modification to the policies' text is considered necessary.</p>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how any new development, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.</p>	<p>Noted. No action. The comments and referenced NPPF and other documentation are considered valuable and useful in the context of the implementation of policies ECF4, 5 &amp; 6 in the case of individual proposals, and particularly SMBC concept masterplanning activities. Current NP policies are believed to be compatible with the comments/ereferenced documents and no modification to the policies' text is considered necessary.</p>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.</p>	<p>Noted. No action. The comments and referenced NPPF and other documentation are considered valuable and useful in the context of the implementation of policies ECF4, 5 &amp; 6 in the case of individual proposals, and particularly SMBC concept masterplanning activities. Current NP policies are believed to be compatible with the comments/ereferenced documents and no modification to the policies' text is considered necessary.</p>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> NPPF Section 8: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</a></p>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> PPG Health and wellbeing section: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing</a></p>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a></p>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	
<p><del>former representations on behalf of West Midlands Police Chief Constable. Policy ECF4 - New Housing Development - Investment in Community Facilities'</del></p> <p>28. The growth in development required across the KDBH NP area up to 2033 will place pressure on existing physical, community, social and green infrastructure, and measures need to be in place to ensure that new growth is supported by appropriate and timely infrastructure provision so that vibrant and sustainable communities can be created and maintained. This will also create opportunities to provide infrastructure solutions to ease and remedy existing issues.</p>	<p>Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.</p>	
<p><b>Cont.</b> 29. The scale of development will inevitably impact the maintenance of appropriate levels of community safety facilities. It is therefore important that Policy ECF4 'New Housing Development – Investment in Community Facilities', paragraph 10.5, reflects this. The CCWMP requests that the supporting text includes reference to the need for S106 and/or CIL investment towards the maintenance of an effective Police presence and for provision of crime reduction facilities, such as CCTV or street lighting, as an additional bullet point example.</p> <p>30. The CCWMP also request that the Neighbourhood Forum work together with the West Midlands Police to ensure that necessary security improvement facilities are included within the list of local community facilities and infrastructure people would like to see to be a candidate for CIL funding.</p>	<p>Supporting text to ECF4 amended</p>	

Y

Employment including Retail and other Commercial Uses		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE AT LAUNCH OF DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 25/11/17</b>		
2 - Most people need to drive to get to work. Proper parking provision for staff and local population is needed. No development should be passed without this.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. See Policy T2.	
24 - We need to keep local shops and amenities.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
28 - Shopping should be considered to be an important part of the planning process.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
31 - Dorridge has been rejuvenated with Sainsburys - beautiful and well used now.	Noted. No action.	
55 - Business Centre - need to do all we can to stimulate new small businesses - maybe digital / Gig but not necessarily. Hebdon Bridge re-invented itself as a focus for small businesses which greatly re-invigorated the town and brought in new blood and funds. KDBH should do the same. Less status quo and more out of box thinking.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
57 - see parking provision above.		
58 - Business rates on the High Street - is it too high?	Noted. No action.	
62 - E3 No shops in new development.	Agree. Plan amended. Good point. Recent business conversion in Knowle has several retail uses. Amend supporting text.	Y
83 - Agree with Policies.	Noted. No action.	
91 - Need to protect the character of the village at all costs.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
97 - In an ideal world.		
108 - Work hard at making Bentley Heath more of a destination. A larger PO in BH? Somehow expand parking opportunities in Bentley Heath.	Noted. No action.	
142 - I think Sainsburys has proved positive in Dorridge despite initial backlash and therefore new shops, amenities should not be automatically resisted. Aroma in Bentley Heath also positive.	Noted. No action.	
158 - More links between young people and future employment.	Noted. Considered out of scope for KDBH NP.	
159 - But do not require any more cafes / restaurants.	Noted. No action.	
160 - Development of a business centre to provide local employment would be very positive.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
161 - Car parking in Bentley Heath needs to be improved to encourage local shopping.	Noted and agreed but depends on new development coming forward. Community Action?	Y
<b>MENTIMETER</b>		
E2: Agree tho could poss see conflict with retention of smaller/independent units	Noted. No action.	
E2: Agree, but carparking provision ESSENTIAL	Noted. No action.	
I support the policy	Noted. No action.	
E1 - adequate car parking provision - where a planning application seeks to rely on existing car parks, the application should be resisted	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required. See policy T2.	
E4-consider a mention of car parking where home working involves visitors attending the premises.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
The plan needs to more reflect more strongly the future will; mean more homeworking.	Policy supports home working.	
The proposed Arden school redevelopment should happen nearer the centre of the village to enable easy access to shops for staff and pupils.	Noted. Matter for Concept Masterplan as part of Local Plan Review.	
I support this policy's intent to enable KDBH to retain its charter & vibrancy & remain a 'working' community not a retirement village	Noted. No action.	
Keep scale of business premises in keeping, move business parking out of village onto dedicated site.	Noted. No obvious sites at present but should be kept under review.	
Add- so that the architecture compliments the Tudor library and buildings such as the McCarthy & Stone development on the High Street.	Covered by design policies. No action.	
I support business growth in the policy.	Noted. No action.	
<b>VIA WEBSITE</b>		
S11.5 Policy E4 – I see no problem in the encouragement of 'home working' as long as this is not a route to the conversion of domestic premises to commercial use. This would result in the loss of a housing unit, while the use should be transferred to a commercial building. This would also apply to conversion of houses to dental surgeries, chiropody, vet surgeries etc;	Conversion to commercial use would require planning permission as it would no longer be working from home.	
E2: Again, how does this differ from current council policy - what is new here? As currently worded it is difficult to disagree!	E3 text provides examples of types of uses that are envisaged. No action.	
E3: Prerequisites for and explanations of what is understood by a business centre are noticeably missing from this text.		
<b>VIA LIBRARY</b>		
The KDBH area is very limited in growth for commercial activities. Therefore more effort and encouragement to retain what we have is essential.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
Not impact parking charges. Access to village prohibitive to independent traders, like Moseley village. Protect against national businesses. Create balance to protect character of local high street. Provision of "hub" self employed drop-in offices - more frequently visited.	Agree. Already in Plan. No further action required.	
<b>SMBC</b>		
Policy E1: Retention of Shops and Services and Policy E2: New Development in Village Centres 1.48 Whilst the policies seek to maintain and improve local shopping facilities and services, it is important to acknowledge that some changes of use do not require planning permission.	Agreed. Amend.	Y
<b>OFFICIAL CONSULTEES</b>		
No comments		

Communications, Infrastructure and Utilities		Action Taken
Source / Comment	Responses from KDBH - NF	
<b>QUESTIONNAIRE AT LAUNCH OF DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 25/11/17</b>		
2 - Digital age is here. We need reliable high speed connections everywhere.	Agree. Already noted in Plan. No further plan update required.	
27 - Signal is poor / non-existent in some areas in the village.	Agree. Already noted in Plan. No further plan update required.	
28 - Very important.	Noted - No action required on the plan	
31 - FTTP needed!!	Noted - No action required on the plan	
37 - Cable supply stops at our house on Warwick Road (S) so new infrastructure will be required for any development at Arden Triangle.	Noted - and the plan sets out policies for how this may acceptably be provided.	
42 - I don't want to see any more mobile phone masts in Dorridge.	Noted - but while this may be aesthetically desirable, some further provision may be necessary and the plan does set out some policy conditions	
55 - Yes, high speed fibre BB- though currently seems fine to me.	Noted - No action required on the plan	
83 - Agree with Policies.	Thank you	
97 - Yes yes yes	Thank you	
103 - No more mobile phone masts!!	Noted - but while this may be aesthetically desirable, some further provision may be necessary and the plan does set out some policy conditions	
108 - It'll take care of itself.	Noted - No action required on the plan	
<b>MENTIMETER</b>		
U1: Agree but shd take account not only of harm to character/appearance of area but also potential health concerns	Noted - No action required on the plan	
It will be crucial for homeworkers for these policies to be in the plan.	Agree. Already noted in Plan. No further plan update required.	
Historically residents have opposed mobile masts etc. Residents need to recognise we can't have it both ways! no masts=no coverage!	Agree. Already noted in Plan. No further plan update required.	
Correction to grammer - should read, " . . . . . planned so as to keep pace with advances . . . . . "	Noted - this error will be corrected	Y
Mobile phone coverage should not be enhanced at the detriment of the health of our community.	Agree. Already noted in Plan. No further plan update required.	
<b>VIA WEBSITE</b>		
No comments		
<b>VIA LIBRARY</b>		
We must keep up with the modern world!	Noted - No action required on the plan	
<b>SMBC</b>		
1.49 Whilst the Council has no specific comment to make on the Policy in this section, it would perhaps be useful to set out what infrastructure requirements the community consider to be a priority.	This is, we believe reasonably clear from the policy drivers and target outcomes. Already a community action?	
<b>OFFICIAL CONSULTEES</b>		
No comments		

**Developers' Representations**

Developer	General Response	More Specific Response
<p>Hunter Page Planning on behalf of <b>Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd</b> Area - East of Warwick Road</p> <p><b>Summary of main matters raised:</b> The representation does not provide comment on the Neighbourhood Plan but is a copy of a representation made in respect of the draft Solihull Local Plan Review. Spitfire's representation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&lt; supports an increase in the overall housing requirement</li> <li>&lt; contests the allocation of housing sites at Shirley and Dickens Heath (outside the</li> <li>&lt; contests the suggested allocations at Knowle (in the draft Local Plan Review)</li> <li>&lt; supports a greater number of sites around rural settlements</li> <li>&lt; states a general intention to deliver housing on sites within the company's control within</li> <li>&lt; contests the Council's Green Belt Assessment scores</li> <li>&lt; promotes land east of Warwick Road, Knowle</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	<p>Amongst other things, the representation is directed at supporting the allocation of housing land east of Warwick Road, Knowle. However, it is a representation concerning the draft Solihull Local Plan Review and does not relate to the Neighbourhood Plan. In any event, the Neighbourhood Plan does not make allocations, nor could it allocate land east of Warwick Road given its Green Belt designation.</p>
<p>Pegasus Group on behalf of <b>Gallagher Estates</b> Area - Four Ashes/Box Trees</p> <p><b>Summary of main matters raised:</b> Gallagher's conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&lt; support the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>&lt; note that the impact of new housing is a major concern / the appropriate level is still to be determined</li> <li>&lt; indicate that there would be advantages in delaying production of the Neighbourhood Plan – have a greater influence on the form and location of future development (in line with new strategic policies) / benefit from proposed changes in national guidance</li> <li>&lt; seek the removal of Policy H1 (until the appropriate housing requirement has been determined through the Local Plan process)</li> <li>&lt; consider that a number of housing policies (H4, H5) are too prescriptive</li> <li>&lt; promote land at Four Ashes Road, Dorridge as a sound housing allocation (Local Plan Review)</li> <li>&lt; welcome the opportunity to comment / have further positive dialogue</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. No action.</p>	<p>The support of Gallagher Estates is welcomed.</p> <p>Although the appropriate level of housing will be determined through the Local Plan Review, the provisions of the Neighbourhood Plan are support by the Neighbourhood Forum's own Local Needs Assessment. The Local Plan Review is the subject of significant delays. The Neighbourhood Plan can be "made" well in advance of adoption of a replacement Local Plan with all the attendant benefits of an up-to-date development plan that reflects local residents' needs and aspirations. Delaying preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan would not give rise to overriding benefits.</p> <p>The quantum set out in Policy H1 is supported by the Local Housing Needs Assessment. Pending debate and up-dating through the Local Plan Review, it is fully justified.</p> <p>To help ensure that the character and appearance of the Area are safeguarded (whilst respecting the conclusion of the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment), a degree of prescription is deemed to be necessary. However, certain minor modifications to the policies have been made in response to other representations.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not make allocations, nor could it allocate land at Four Ashes Road given its Green Belt designation.</p> <p>There will be further opportunities for comment and positive dialogue.</p>
<p>Cerda Planning on behalf of <b>Kler Group</b> Area - Arden Triangle</p> <p><b>Summary of main matters raised:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&lt; Strong objection to Policy H1. Not aligned to strategic needs. Conflict with emerging Local Plan and National Planning Policy Framework. Should refer to 1,050 houses or higher – to take account of proposed housing allocations (draft Local Plan Review) at Hampton Road and the Arden Triangle</li> <li>&lt; No objection to Policy H2</li> <li>&lt; No objection to Policy H3 providing there is sufficient justification. Need for cascade mechanism</li> <li>&lt; No objection to Policy H4 providing correspondence with latest household projections, Strategic Housing Market Assessment and emerging Local Plan; also, a degree of flexibility to allow for the whole Local Plan period.</li> <li>&lt; No objection to Policy H5 providing correspondence with latest Housing Needs Survey and Strategic Housing Market Assessment</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p>	<p>The quantum set out in Policy H1 (which does not include windfalls) is supported by the Neighbourhood Forum's Local Housing Needs Assessment. The "strategic needs" figure of 1,050 (and related allocations) is not accepted by the Forum and will be debated through the Local Plan Review examination when this eventually takes place.</p> <p>The policy is adequately justified. There is no need for a cascade mechanism. If, at the time of availability, there are no households with a strong local connection, the property would automatically be available for qualifying residents outside KDBH.</p> <p>Adjustments have been made in response to representations by SMBC. There is appropriate correspondence with the statistical projections. Monitoring will be appropriate to adjust to any imbalances.</p> <p>Adjustments have been made in response to representations by SMBC. There is appropriate correspondence with the latest surveys and assessments.</p>
<p>GVA on behalf of <b>Heyford Developments Limited</b> Area - Blue Lake Road/Norton Green Lane</p> <p><b>Summary of main matters raised:</b></p>		



Developer	General Response	More Specific Response
<p>Hunter Page Planning on behalf of <b>Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&lt; Policy H4 – specialist housing for the elderly: Clarity and conformity issues</li> <li>&lt; Policy H4 – Market housing mix: unjustified and prohibitive. Lack of clarity concerning “local designs and streetscapes”.</li> <li>&lt; Policy H5: Broadly acceptable. Policies H4 and H5 could be merged.</li> <li>&lt; Policy H6: Possibly superfluous. Issues of clarity and conformity.</li> <li>&lt; Policy H7: Supported</li> <li>&lt; Policy H8: Confusing reference to another policy.</li> <li>&lt; Policy D1: Need to see the Assessment and Study referenced in the text.</li> <li>&lt; Policy D1: Unnecessary duplication concerning extensions.</li>   <li>&lt; Policy D2: Strong support</li> <li>&lt; Policy T1: Concerns about conformity, viability, practicality, and flexibility.</li>   <li>&lt; Policies T2 and T3: Strong support</li> <li>&lt; Policy T4: Issue of clarity</li> <li>&lt; Policy T4: Contribution shouldn’t be under the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>&lt; Policy T4: 750m radius requires justification</li> <li>&lt; Policy T5: Strong support</li> <li>&lt; Policy T6: Strong support but could be more flexible.</li> <li>&lt; Policy T7: No in-principle objection</li> <li>&lt; Policy T8: Supported</li> <li>&lt; Policies T9 and T10: Strong support</li> <li>&lt; Policy ECF1: Support but with concern regarding “adverse impact on existing provision”.</li> <li>&lt; Policy ECF2: Strong support</li> <li>&lt; Policy ECF3: Support</li> <li>&lt; Policy ECF4: Support but question the enforceability of textural provisions regarding provision of capacity to meet additional need.</li> <li>&lt; Policy ECF5: To “allow proportionate use” would be impractical.</li>   <li>&lt; Policy ECF6 – Community Access Statements: Conformity issues</li>   <li>&lt; Policy ECF6 – Proportionate daytime availability: Not practical or achievable.</li>   <li>&lt; Policies E1 to E4: Strong support</li> <li>&lt; Policy U1: Strong support</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Agreed. Plan amended</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Agreed. Plan amended</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p>	<p>It is considered that the provisions are clear and do not conflict with the development plan.</p> <p>Primarily, the Forum relies on the evidence of the Residents’ Survey and of the KDBH Local Needs Assessment. There should be no problems of interpretation.</p> <p>Policies H4 and H5 deal with different matters.</p> <p>It is considered that the provisions are clear and do not conflict with the development plan.</p> <p>Reference to Policy D1 deleted.</p> <p>The character assessment and the masterplanning study are now available.</p> <p>The matters addressed in Policy D1 are different from those in Policy H8 on Extensions and Alterations – no undue duplication.</p> <p>Certain changes have been made in response to comments by SMBC. The policy has flexibility and reflects local circumstances. There are no perceived conformity issues.</p> <p>The policy is sufficiently clear.</p> <p>Entirely appropriate for the Plan to address necessary contributions.</p> <p>Considered entirely reasonable</p> <p>The policy is considered to be sufficiently flexible.</p> <p>Clarification added</p> <p>The relevant text is simply giving examples of the sorts of provision that might be justified.</p> <p>Proportionate use will be an important consideration and will be a matter of judgement in the circumstances of the case.</p> <p>Whilst Community Access Statement are an innovation within the Neighbourhood Plan, there is no conflict with the development plan or national policy.</p> <p>The concept of proportionality is an important consideration. The outcome will reflect the circumstances of individual cases.</p>
<p>Savills on behalf of <b>St Philips</b> Area - Bentley Heath</p> <p><b>Summary of main matters raised:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&lt; Policy VC1: The Solihull Green Belt Assessment should be considered within this Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>&lt; Policy VC2: Strong support</li> <li>&lt; Policy VC3: Strong support</li> <li>&lt; Policy VC4: Strong support</li> <li>&lt; Policy VC5: Strong support. Terminology requires further clarification.</li> <li>&lt; Policy NE1: There should be scope for a replacement option.</li>   <li>&lt; Policy NE2: The policy should refer to conservation and enhancement (rather than preservation and restoration).</li> <li>&lt; Policy H1: Objection to proposed number of houses. Not sufficient to meet housing needs of the Borough. Should provide a greater share of overall housing need. Using a proportional approach (as in the AECOM Local Needs Assessment) is not a recognised test. A figure of 1,040 should be used as a projections basis.</li> <li>&lt; Policy H2: Construction practices / Refuse storage – should be regulated through conditions</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p> <p>Noted. No action.</p>	<p>There is no need to refer to this document in the Neighbourhood Plan. Green Belt releases and the eventual scale of new housing will be determined through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>The wording of the policy and the supporting text are adequate for the purposes of interpretation. Protection of features is the focus of the policy. The Forum would not wish to encourage replacement options, through explicit reference, although this would be a possibility in appropriate circumstances. Preservation and restoration have a slightly different focus. There is no need to repeat the wording of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Forum considers that that the results of its specially commissioned Local Needs Assessment are an appropriate basis for assessing the scale of new housing set out in Policy H1.</p> <p>Planning conditions will apply but, in advance of the submission of an application, the text clarifies what is expected of developers. Refuse storage, for example, needs to be planned into developments at the design stage not dealt with as an afterthought as the result of a condition.</p>



Developer	General Response	More Specific Response
Hunter Page Planning on behalf of <b>Spitfire Bespoke Homes Ltd</b> < Land at Lady Byron Lane should be identified as a location where care home accommodation would be supported	Noted. No action.	Appropriate provision is made under Policy H4.